





AN  
EXAMINATION OF THE EVIDENCE

ADDUCED BY

MR. KEARY,

AGAINST THE

AUTHENTICITY OR VALIDITY OF CERTAIN  
PASSAGES FROM THE FATHERS,

CONTAINED IN THE

“FAITH OF CATHOLICS, ON CERTAIN POINTS OF CONTRO-  
VERSY, COMPILED BY REV. JOS. BERINGTON  
AND REV. JOHN KIRK.”

---

BY THE REV. J. WATERWORTH, M.A.

---

LONDON :  
JOSEPH BOOKER, 61, NEW BOND STREET.

---

1834.

# EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESS

## W R E E N

THE WITNESS OF THE FACTS OF THE CASE  
AND THE FACTS OF THE CASE

THE WITNESS OF THE FACTS OF THE CASE  
AND THE FACTS OF THE CASE

THE WITNESS OF THE FACTS OF THE CASE  
AND THE FACTS OF THE CASE

THE WITNESS OF THE FACTS OF THE CASE  
AND THE FACTS OF THE CASE

THE WITNESS OF THE FACTS OF THE CASE  
AND THE FACTS OF THE CASE

THE WITNESS OF THE FACTS OF THE CASE  
AND THE FACTS OF THE CASE

AN  
EXAMINATION OF THE EVIDENCE,

&c. &c.

---

A PAMPHLET has lately been published by the Rev. William Keary, rector of Nunnington, entitled "A Continuation of the Ampleforth Discussion, comprising a Reply to the Letter of the Rev. Richard Towers." In it, the sincere and charitable Christian will be grieved to find an attempt to revive all the bitterness and invective of by-gone controversy, and the friend to truth will regret, that the exploded calumnies of the most bigotted controversialists have found another patron amongst the ministers of religion.

The religious belief of more than one half of the Christian world is designated by Mr. Keary, by the opprobrious names of *Poper*y and *Romanism*; against its professors, whom he blushes not to disgrace himself by nick-naming Papists, he brings the grievous charge of Idolatry;\* and against its pastors, an infamous and horrid traffick in crime, and the damnation of the souls of their flocks;† whilst his opponents he accuses of adducing, in support of their opinions, not the genuine and authentic sentiments of the Fathers, but "palpable well-known forgeries."‡

But, happily, the Rector of Nunnington is not the man to succeed in raising the slumbering spectres, that frightened more credulous days from their propriety. In attempting this unenviable task, he has sadly mistaken his own powers. His is not the wit, or even the brilliancy of language, which alone can give a zest to such effusions; nor does he possess that imposing variety of information, which, by perplexing a subject, confounds the mind of the reader, and gains a negative species of assent, consisting rather in an unwillingness to appear less learned, and in inability to judge, than in a clear and

\* Page 1.

† Note to page 19.

‡ Page 5.



positive acquiescence of the understanding in the validity of the argument. To adopt Mr. Keary's style and method, is a perilous experiment. If successful, its effect is transient, as it is based on a phantom; but if it prove a failure, the attempt causes even the best friends of the writer to suspect the weakness of a cause, which could stand in need of such support; whilst the impartial judge rises from the perusal of the vituperation and calumny, with a feeling of disgust similar to that with which he would turn from the unmeasured diatribes of the most abandoned members of society. It was thought, and it would have been well, that like Prospero's wand, such unholy arts had been for ever gone, and buried

“ certain fathoms in the earth,  
“ Deeper than did ever plummet sound.”

We were some time before we could conceive any possible motive for the conduct of the Rev. Rector: nor do we know whether, after all our conjectures, we have fathomed the mystery. Whether the Rector of Nunnington, or the Rectors of the neighbouring parishes, be fearful lest the spirit of resistance to the payment of Church-Rates, tythes, and the discharge of such like burthens, extend to their districts, and thus attempt a diversion in the public mind, I know not,—but experience has taught us, that the no-Popery cry has always preceded and accompanied every attempt at improvement, and been the rallying cry of those most interested in perpetuating extortion, oppression, and every species of abuse. However, be this as it may, it must be obvious to every one that the subject, discussed by Mr. Keary, required not the introduction of vituperation. The only, or at least the most important, question that called for the remarks of the Rector, was one of fact, and might, therefore, have been easily disposed of. But, that the general reader may be enabled fully to understand the subject, I must give a short history of the nature of the controversy.

A discussion, by what party provoked it matters not, has been held near Ampleforth. The Rector of Nunnington, uninvited, as he assures us, by the immediate Rector of the place, appeared as the champion of Protestantism; whilst the Rev. Prior of Ampleforth College, Mr. Towers, supported the doctrines of the Church of which he is a minister. The subject debated was the Invocation of the Saints. In favor of the lawfulness of this practice, besides the word of God, the Catholic disputant appealed to the belief of the Pastors of the Church, in all ages, and endeavoured to shew, by actual quotation from their works, that all the virtue and learning of

antiquity were in his favour. As a compendious and valuable digest of their opinions, "the Faith of Catholics," compiled by Messrs. Kirk and Berington, seems to have been adduced and quoted.

Mr. Hampson, another Catholic disputant, I quote from Mr. Keary's pamphlet,\*—"commenced towards the close of the first evening's discussion, to recite several passages from these primitive writers, in which I was obliged to stop him, as his references *were all to what are called the spurious Fathers, being, in fact, forgeries committed, in their names, by the ignorant monks of the middle ages.* I do not, indeed, by any means, accuse the Rev. Gentleman as conscious that he was about to adduce such disreputable vouchers; as I rather suppose, from the exact coincidence of his quotations, that he gleaned his knowledge at second-hand from that great arsenal of modern controvertists, Berington and Kirk's book; against whom, however, as I asserted in your hearing, I do bring *the discreditable charge, and am prepared to prove it, that out of forty-two quotations, adduced in support of this doctrine, twenty-two are palpable well-known forgeries; and the remainder either utterly irrelevant, or from writers of the fifth and sixth centuries, who are of no authority on the subject.*" It is clear, from this passage, that Mr. Keary feels the force of the argument, which Catholics are accustomed to adduce in favor of their doctrines, by shewing the conformity of these doctrines with the opinions of the early writers of the Church. In fact, he tells us that "he himself, on the subject debated, quoted several passages from what are called the Fathers, that is to say, writers who lived during the four first ages of the Christian Church, (to which period the term is generally restricted,) who are usually adduced to shew the agreement or disagreement of the alleged dogmas, with those early and justly-esteemed purest ages of Christianity."† The work from which he quoted, he declares to be one of his own compiling,‡

\* Page 5.

† Upon what authority Mr. Keary asserts, that the term Father is restricted to the writers of the four first ages of the Christian Church, we know not: that this is not 'generally' the case, as he pretends, is notorious. Nor can we see by what process he admits the authority of the last writer, for instance, of the fourth century, but discards the first of the fifth, who was probably, for a long period, a contemporary of the writers of the preceding age, instructed in their schools, favored with their friendship, and, no doubt, perfectly conversant and thoroughly imbued with their opinions.

‡ "On being questioned," says Mr. Keary, "as to the authority of the small printed pamphlet from which I read the several extracts,

and is, no doubt, intended to counteract the effects of the learned labours of Messrs. Kirk and Berington.

If we take Mr. Keary's assertion as a proof of the alleged fact, that the writers of the four first centuries lived in the "justly-esteemed purest ages of Christianity," whilst their successors of the fifth century were, no doubt, to complete the antithesis, condemned to wallow in comparatively foul and corrupted times, the Rev. Rector will assuredly see that we shew but little anxiety to find fault, and small wish to go out of our way to seek matter for controversy.

We are to believe, therefore, reader,—Mr. Keary assures us of it,—that the writers of the four first centuries are alone generally called Fathers; that the Catholic disputants, Mr. Keary *rather supposes it*, "gleaned their information second-hand from that great arsenal of modern controvertists, Berington and Kirk's Book;" that the ignorant monks of the middle ages are the authors of the passages which these gentlemen attempt to foist upon the world as the productions of writers of the "justly-esteemed-purest ages of Christianity." This last assertion requires, indeed, a considerable portion of faith in the worthy Rector's judgment and learning; for if we had not his word for it, we might be inclined to doubt, whether those men can with propriety be called *ignorant*, whom Mr. Keary can shew were the contrivers and executors of a literary imposition of such enormous difficulty and magnitude, requiring so varied a style, and so intimate an acquaintance with the manners, customs, feelings, ways of thinking, and the thousand other circumstances, which render forgery, even on the smallest scale, so perilous and slippery an attempt. Still, even if we grant Mr. Keary that this was not only possible, but actually accomplished, he will have enough to do to make good the main point of his assertion. For he has to prove, that "of forty-two quotations, adduced by Messrs. Kirk and Berington, in support of the Invocation of Saints and Angels, twenty-two are palpable well-known forgeries; and the remainder either utterly irrelevant, or from writers of the fifth and sixth centuries, who are of no authority on the subject."

proving the discrepancy of these Fathers with the modern tenets of Rome, I stated, that as I was its author, I was personally answerable for its correctness, both as to reference and translation." We unfortunately have not seen this production. From the specimens of translation which occur in the pamphlet before us, it must be a rich and precious literary treat. Time and opportunity favoring, we may call on Mr. Keary "to answer for its correctness, both as to reference and translation."



Now, if it should so happen that the Rev. Rector fail in making good this assertion, what ought to be his punishment? As we do not wish to be unnecessarily severe on the good Mr. Keary, we will allow him to choose his own measure and mode of chastisement.—“I allow,” says he,\* “that if this be *mere assertion*, that I deserve all, and even more than all the abuse he (Rev. R. Towers) heaps upon me.” The world will, we doubt not, acknowledge that Mr. Keary is correct in his opinion. For, surely, if instead of proving that his adversaries have cited “palpable—well-known forgeries,”† it can be shewn that not one, even one single extract contained in that collection, is clearly spurious,—that the quotations all tend either positively to prove the lawfulness of invoking the saints, or directly and powerfully serve to illustrate that doctrine;—if, in the course of Mr. Keary’s publication, we find him having recourse to the most disgraceful shuffles, to incorrect translation, alterations of the punctuation, and other similar artifices,—odious in any man, but horrible in a minister of religion: I think that abuse, so far from being a punishment suited to the case, would be lost on such a man; and that he must be left for an adequate correction, to the contempt and scorn of an insulted public.

Though the attack on “the Faith of Catholics,” and the statement of argument in favor of his singular assertion, be the principal, it is not the only object of Mr. Keary’s pamphlet. The Scapulary, Simon Stock, Enoch, and the Carmelites; the Breviary, Purgatory, and St. Bernard; the Devotion to the Sacred Heart and Dr. Milner; S. Bridget, Ribadaneira, and S. Catharine; Bonaventure and the Virgin Mary; Protestantism and the ruined abbeys of England, find themselves some in strange, others in well-merited juxtaposition, and pass in scenic rapidity and gorgeousness before the eye of the reader, exhibiting a rich specimen of Protestant liberality, reformed credulousness, and clerical misrepresentation that may have been equalled, but surely never surpassed, even in those days of gross ignorance and unblushing imposture that followed the Reformation. These things I pass by. The filth that the charitable Rector has taken so much trouble to rake together, will befoul no one but himself. But there is one charge which I did think was “too bad” even for the lips of the veracious Mr. Keary. On this, before proceeding to the direct object of these pages, I must beg the reader to allow me to make a few observations. The subject which I allude to is that of Indulgences.

\* Page 12. † Ib.

The Rev. William Keary defines a plenary indulgence to be a full pardon of all sins.\* I should think meanly indeed of myself, of my religion, and of the public, were I to undertake to refute this threadbare calumny by evidence or argument. There is not a child in any of our schools that has arrived at the age of maturity, that cannot instruct on this point, as on many others, the Rev. Rector of Nunnington. Where has Mr. Keary lived, or rather dreamed out his existence, not to know, that we disclaim, reprobate, and abhor the soul-damning doctrine, which he has the foolishness (another word would better suit the case, but we refrain) to attribute to our Church? Does he know the meaning of his own words, and the tremendous imputation which they stamp on half, or more than one half, the Christian world? Does he know that he impeaches our pastors of high treason against their God, with trafficking for the damnation of those souls for which Christ died? If he do not, let him learn the weight of language, and know that he ascribes that to us, which we believe neither man, nor angel, no, nor God himself can do,—give to man the power of infringing with impunity the eternal and immutable principles of virtue. I hope that ignorance may have led him into error; that he is a man to whom age has brought no experience, and experience no knowledge: who has read our works without understanding them; whose obtuseness of intellect prevented him from being able to comprehend the most simple and repeated explanations; for, if he be not, if he have wilfully calumniated his neighbour, if he have, knowingly and deliberately, imputed this blasphemous doctrine to the pastors of our Church, to serve a wretched purpose, to rouse the public indignation, or to obtain a momentary victory, I know not what more dreadful torment I can leave him to, than to the stinging reproaches of his own conscience, and the awful expectation of that great day, on which a just Judge will render to every man according to his works. But, enough: I appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober,—and doubt not that Mr. Keary will agree with me, that it would have been better, for the sake of truth and honesty, that the last twenty pages of his pamphlet had never seen the light.

I shall now confine myself to that portion of Mr. Keary's pamphlet, which contends, and attempts to prove, that of forty-two passages cited by Messrs. Kirk and Berington, in favor of the Invocation of the Saints and Angels, twenty-two are forgeries, and the remainder nothing to the purpose. I

am afraid that the discussion, into which I shall be forced to enter, will not always interest the reader. But he will remember that I only follow the path marked out by the Rev. Controversist, and if that be arid and wearisome, with him, and not with me, lies the blame. I might, indeed, by a well-told tale of the profits that accrued to the magnanimous authors of the Reformation by a denial of this doctrine—in the pillage of many a costly shrine, and sainted image,—win a smile or a sigh from the reader; but, even with Mr. Keary's example before me, I abstain. The reader, no doubt, seeks for the truth; and this, with the exercise of a little ordinary industry in the examination, and common candour in the production of evidence, may be come to most easily. With this view, and to render the subject as plain as possible, I shall first state the doctrine which the extracts that follow are cited to confirm, then produce the passages one by one as they occur in "The Faith of Catholics;" examine the authenticity and force of each, and reply to the objections, if any, of Mr. Keary.

"THE INVOCATION OF ANGELS AND SAINTS." *Faith of Catholics*, p. 427. Second Edition.

*" Proposition.*

" Catholics are persuaded, that the Angels and the Saints in heaven, replenished with charity, *pray for us*, the fellow members of the latter here on earth; that *they rejoice in our conversion*; that seeing God, they see and know in him all things suitable to their happy state; and that God may be inclined *to hear their requests made in our behalf*, and *for their sakes* grant us many favors; therefore we believe that it is *good and profitable to invoke their intercession*. Can this manner of invocation be more injurious to Christ our Mediator, then it is for one Christian to beg the prayers of another here on earth? However, Catholics are not taught so to rely on the prayers of others, as to neglect their own duty to God, in imploring his divine mercy and goodness; in mortifying the deeds of the flesh; in despising the world; in loving and serving God and their neighbours; in following the footsteps of Christ our Lord, who is the way, the truth, and the life; to whom be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen."

After reciting several texts from the sacred Scriptures in confirmation of the above doctrine, the learned editors refer us to St. Irenæus, a writer of the second century, a bishop, and most probably a martyr, as holding similar sentiments to those contained in their proposition.

I. The extract is taken from that writer's work against Here-



sies, which is undoubtedly authentic:\* nor does Mr. Keary presume to deny its genuineness. The passage is as follows: "As Eve was seduced to fly from God, so was the Virgin Mary induced to obey him, that she might become *the advocate of her that had fallen.*" *Adv. Hæres. L. v. c. xix. p. 316.* On this passage Mr. Keary remarks: "Had Berington given the context, and not a very garbled portion, his and Mr. Towers' readers would not have been misled by the supposition, that this Father could have argued so inconclusively, as to make the virgin an advocate centuries before she was in existence," *p. 15.* As Mr. Keary favors us with his own translation of the passage and of the context, it may be as well first to place the ancient Latin version, as given by Grabe, before the reader.† This passage Mr. Keary translates thus. I preserve his italics. "As Eve, by the discourse of a fallen angel, was seduced to apostatize from God, so Mary, by the discourse of a good angel was evangelized that she should bear God in her womb, obedient to his word. And as the former was seduced to disobey God, so the latter was persuaded to obey him; in order that the Virgin Mary might *thence* become the advocate of Eve. Thus, as the human race was doomed to death by a virgin, so the human

\* We have nothing now remaining of this Father, besides his five books against Heresies, and fragments of some other pieces. His works were published by Erasmus, then by F. Feuarent, and in 1702 by Grabe. Dom Massuet, a Benedictine Maurist Monk, gave another and a more correct edition in 1710. Psaff, a Lutheran, published, in 1715, from a MS. in the library of Turin, four other fragments of this father. The second fragment is a remarkable proof of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Learned men are not agreed about the time of Irenæus himself, or of his principal work against heresies. Dodwell supposes that it was written in 176 or 177. (*Dodw. 4 Diss. Irenæ. sect. 41.*) Grabe speaks dubiously. (*Prolegomena de Vit. et Script. Iren. sect. 1, 2.*) Du Pin thinks Irenæus was born a little before the year 140, and died in 202. (*Nouv. Bibl. Irenée.*) Massuet contends that the work was written about the year 192. (*Dissertat. II. sect. 47.*) Tillemont is nearly of the same opinion as the latter writer. (*Mem. Eccles. Irenée. Artic. VII.*) Lardner thinks that the work was not published quite so soon as the year 178. (*Credib. of Gosp. Tes. tom. II, p. 169.*)

† "Quemadmodum enim illa (Eva) per angelicum sermonem seducta est, ut effugeret Deum, prævaricata verbum ejus, ita et hæc per evangelicum sermonem evangelizata est, ut portaret Deum, obediens ejus verbo. Et sicut illa seducta, ut effugeret Deum, sic hæc suasa est obedire Deo, *uti virginis Evæ fieret advocata.* Et quemadmodum astrictum est morti genus humanum per Virginem, salvatur per Virginem, æqua lana disposita virginalis inobedientia, per Virginalem obedientiam." *Iren. Opera, Oxoniæ, 1702, p. 429.*



race might be delivered also *through* a Virgin, the balance being equally held between the disobedience of one Virgin, and the obedience of another." The reader will have observed that two words are put in Italics, by Mr. Keary, no doubt with a view to draw particular attention to them, as peculiarly deserving of notice, and as furnishing a clue to the whole passage. Now it rather unfortunately happens, that the first of these words, "*thence*," is not in the original; and that the second, namely, "*through*," is incorrect, if he mean to convey a meaning by it anyway different from that of the word "*by*," which is placed in the preceding member of the sentence, as both prepositions are the same in the original. It is a matter of minor criticism to notice, that his rendering "*salvatur*," by "*might be delivered*" is not just; *salvatur*, is evidently in antithesis with the preceding words "*adstrictum est morti*," and, both by the common laws of grammar, and to bear out the comparison, its ordinary meaning "*is saved*," must be retained. But to give it this meaning, overturned at once, as is evident, the whole objection of the ingenious Rector.

The Virgin Mary is not spoken of as an advocate *centuries before she was in existence*, but as becoming an advocate, and saving the human race—the expression is the Father's—*when she bore in her womb, and gave birth to her divine son*. The reader will perceive, that the word "*thence*" was introduced by Mr. Keary for the same motive as he translated "*salvatur*" by, *might be delivered*.

With the exceptions stated above, I have no objection to adopt the Rector's not very elegant translation, and the passage will run thus: "As Eve, by the discourse of a fallen angel, was seduced to apostatise from God; so Mary, by the discourse of a good angel, was evangelized, that she should bear God, in her womb obedient to his word. And as the former was seduced to disobey God, so the latter was persuaded to obey him; in order that the Virgin Mary might become the advocate of Eve. Thus, as the human race was doomed to death by a Virgin, so the human race is saved also by a Virgin, the balance being equally held between the disobedience of one virgin, and the obedience of another."

Now, it really requires some ingenuity to see how the extract given in the "*Faith of Catholics*" differs materially from this. Let the intelligent reader compare them, and judge whether the censure passed on the learned Editors was merited. The additional matter has either no effect at all upon the meaning, or favors their view of it. Mary is called *the advocate of Eve* by S. Irenæus, but in what sense he does

not explain, nor does the context lead us to the solution. It is, therefore, highly unbecoming in any one, but particularly in a minister of God, to abandon the strict truth so far as to assert, "that the extract is garbled, misleads the reader, and causes the Father to argue inconclusively." The public will now see on whom these severe charges justly fall.

It has been shewn that the passage, as extracted by Messrs. Kirk and Berington, is authentic, correctly translated, and gives the entire meaning of the author. They present it to the world without note or comment, as, in their opinion, confirming the lawfulness of considering the blessed Virgin, as an advocate and intercessor. In this opinion they may be wrong. As the judgment of individuals differs on most other points, some may be found to consider this passage as inconclusive. But this does not therefore justify Mr. Keary, in accusing them of giving a garbled extract, calculated to mislead their readers.

This might suffice; but, as I am of opinion that the passage is highly confirmatory of the Catholic doctrine, I shall, perhaps, be excused if I lay before Mr. Keary, my reasons for this opinion. St. Irenæus assures us, that the Virgin Mary, by believing the angel, was made the advocate of Eve. Now, as Eve when this happened had been long consigned to her parent Earth, either Mr. Keary must admit that the Virgin Mary became an advocate and intercessor for Eve, though Eve was dead and consigned to the tomb, and thus admit the lawfulness of prayers for the dead, and the consequent doctrine of Purgatory, or he must understand by the name Eve, the posterity of Eve. If he adopt, as no doubt he will, the latter alternative, he admits at once, in my judgment, that the passage of Irenæus was not only correctly extracted in the "Faith of Catholics," but justly too. For if she be the advocate and intercessor of the posterity of Eve, and of the human race, as Irenæus makes no limitation to the duration of her intercessorship, I see not how Mr. Keary can. She is, therefore, according to the plain and full meaning of the words, still our advocate. S. Irenæus gives her that title, and considers her, in his day, in that character, long after her passage to a happier world. From the time that she believed in the word of God, she became our advocate; and as the human race "was doomed to death by a virgin, so the human race is saved by a virgin." Though Mr. Keary speaks so feelingly of the value of these writers of the "justly-esteemed purest ages of Christianity," I am afraid that his Protestant principles will be much shocked at the bold language of Irenæus.

II. Origen comes next in order in the valuable compilation before me.\* From this writer five passages are extracted, all taken from his Commentaries on the Sacred Writings. The first is from his Twenty-sixth Homily on the Book of Numbers. As Mr. Keary has not made any remarks on this passage, the authenticity of which is indeed undisputed,† he must consider it, if his assertion be good, as nothing to the purpose. The passage is as follows:—"Who can doubt, that *our holy Fathers aid us by their prayers*, and strengthen and excite us by the example of their actions, as also by the writings they have left us; herein teaching and instructing us how to fight against the adverse powers, and in what manner these contests are to be maintained? Thus they fight for us, and advance armed before us." *Homil. XXVI, in Num. t. II. p. 373.*

If the reader will but turn to the Proposition which is placed at the head of Messrs. Berington and Kirk's disquisition on the Invocation of the Saints and Angels, he will find that the first opinion stated in that proposition, is clearly established by this passage, to have been advocated by Origen. That celebrated writer declares, that though dead in the Lord, the Saints, "*by their prayers* and writings, still fight for us, and advance armed before us." If Mr. Keary consider the passage nothing to the purpose, and as containing nothing opposed to his notions of sound Protestant doctrine, we shall

\* Origen was born in Egypt about the year 184, and died about A.D. 253. For an account of Origen's works, the reader and Mr. Keary may refer to *Huet, Origenian. L. III. cap. 3, 4. Cave, Hist. Lit. 1. A. Fabric. Bibl. Gr. l. v, cap. 1, sect. 26. Basnage, Ann. 203. n. XXII, XXIII. Du Pin, Bibl. Tillem. Mem. Eccles. Origine, Art. 27 et sess. et notes 29-41.* The best edition of Origen's works is that published by the Benedictine, Charles Vincent de la Rue, at Paris, in 1733. This monk died after editing the two first volumes, but had prepared a third. This his nephew published in 1749, and added himself in 1759, the fourth, or last volume. All these writers agree that the work from which Messrs. Kirk and Berington have quoted the first passage is genuine. The reader, if he wish for one satisfactory authority in favor of the authenticity of the Commentary on the Book of Numbers, may consult the second volume of Origen's works by the Benedictine monk.

† "Je ne sçay point que personne en doute." *Tillem. Mem. Eccles. tom. III, p. 559.* The observation made by Du Pin, (vol. I, p. 101) on the free translation of these Homilies by Rufinus, it is well-known, must be confined to the passages which treat of original sin, the pre-existence of the soul, and the other peculiar opinions ascribed to Origen.



be happy to hear him use such language in his public ministry, and assure his flock, that the saints that have gone before them, pray for them to the Lord, and thus fight part of their battles for them, in their struggles with the flesh and the world. When he shall have gone thus far, it will not be difficult to shew him, if not the consequent and necessary truth, at least the plausibility of the whole of the Catholic doctrine on this subject, and its analogy and conformity with this supposition.

2. The second extract from Origen goes to prove the same opinion. "And of all the holy men who have quitted this life, retaining their charity towards those whom they left behind, we may be allowed to say, that they are anxious for their salvation, and that they assist them by their prayers and their mediation with God.\* For it is written in the books of the Maccabees: *This is Jeremiah the prophet of God, who always prays for the people.*"—*Lib. iii. in Cant. Cantic. T. iii. p. 75.*

Though Mr. Keary could not deny the authenticity of Origen's Commentary on the Book of Numbers, he informs us, that he has met with two critics who call in question the genuineness of the work before us, namely, the Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles. "Of this work," says he, "Possevin asserts, that it is not his (Origen's),—in which opinion Sixtus agrees, by saying it was not written by Origen, but by some uncertain author."

Mr. Keary is unfortunate in the selection of his authorities: neither Possevin nor Sixtus Senensis has acquired great celebrity as a critic. And what is more unfortunate, neither of these writers wrote at a time when a correct opinion as to what was really from Origen's pen, could with prudence be formed. Possevin died in 1612, at the age of 78, a better politician than critic; and Sixtus, who passed through the different states of Jew, Christian, Heretic, Franciscan, and Dominican, is celebrated for any thing rather than his ability in criticism. Huet gave to the world his *Origeniana* in 1668, consisting of Origen's Commentaries on the New Testament, accompanied with a valuable Life and learned Notes. Montfaucon, in 1713, edited the *Hexapla* and *Tetrapla*. But it was not till 1759, that any thing like a complete edition of Origen's works had been published. A careful criticism has shewn that the Commentary on the Canticle is really Origen's. Lardner† ex-

\* Juvare eos precibus, atque interventu suo apud Deum.

† Credib. of Gosp. Test. vol. ii. Article Origen, No. 1.



presses no doubt of its genuineness; Tillemont\* is of opinion that it is Origen's. The Benedictine edition of his works gives it as his;† besides others, as Huet‡ and Pearson,§ who argue in its favour. In a word, there is no reasonable doubt of its authenticity; and, consequently, Messrs. Kirk and Berington were justified in referring to it.

But do Possevin and Sixtus really assert, that Origen's *Third Book on the Canticle of Canticles*, from which the corrected extract is taken, is not genuine? Mr. Keary assures us that they do, and even cites the page of the work in which this assertion is to be found. In the passage referred to, Possevin is speaking of the fragment of a Commentary *on the two first chapters of the Canticles*, which he observes has been ascribed by some to St. Jerome,|| and by others to St. Austin. He, for his part, does not pretend to determine to whom it belongs, but considers it as of great value. Sixtus Senensis says nothing more. Mr. Keary is, perhaps, not aware that Origen wrote two distinct Commentaries on the Canticles, and that we have fragments from both these works. On what grounds he has come to the conclusion that Possevin and Sixtus speak of the particular fragment to which the Faith of Catholics refers, I know not; there is nothing in their works to justify it. But if there were, their opinion, formed when they had such few means of comparing this fragment with Origen's well-known works, would be of little or no weight against the decided authorities in its favour, from men such as Huet and the Benedictine Editor of his works, whose reputation, in a great measure, rests on their laborious investigation and study of the remains of this writer. Du Pin, fol. i. p. 100, declares, that in his opinion "the arguments against its authenticity are very weak, when compared with those in favour of its genuineness."

3. The third extract is from a Homily on the Prophet Ezekiel. The writers who attest the authenticity of the two preceding extracts, consider this also as clearly genuine. In it the learned Father offers up a prayer to the angels, whom he considers to be every where present, for support and assistance. "The angels," he says, "are every where present: come then, thou Angel, receive him that is changed from his former error; from the doctrine of demons; from loud-speak-

\* Mem. Eccl. Origen, Tom. iii. Art. 31, p. 565. See also his Note 41, in Origen, p. 776.

† Tom. iii. ‡ Huet Origeniana, pp. 248, 249.

§ Pearson in Ign. Tom. i. p. 106-112. He tells us that Blondel and Aubertin agree with him.

|| In quibusdam codicibus vetustis erat nomine Hieronymi prænotatum.

ing iniquity; and having received him, soothe him as a kind physician, and instruct him, for he is yet young. And call to thee the associates of thy ministry, that together you may train to the faith all those that have been deceived. *For there is greater joy in heaven upon one sinner that doth penance, than upon ninety-nine just.* Every creature exults and rejoices with those that shall be saved. For the expectation of the creature waiteth for the revelation of the sons of God.”—(*Rom. viii. 19.*)—*Hom. i. in Ezek. T. iii. p. 358.\**

4. We have next a most valuable passage from one of Origen's Homilies on the Lamentations of the Hebrew Prophet. This is undoubtedly by far the most express of the five extracts in favour of the Invocation of Saints, given us in the Faith of Catholics. As such, it deserved the particular attention of Mr. Keary, and the reader must feel disappointed to see him waste so much time and learning, in attempting to shew the spuriousness of other passages, and yet leave the most important untouched and unscathed. Eusebius† tells us, that, in his time, five books of these Homilies were extant. The passage is as follows:—“I fall down on my knees, and not presuming, on account of my crimes, to present my prayer to God, I will invoke all the saints to my assistance. O, ye Saints of Heaven, I beseech you, with a sorrow full of sighs and tears, fall at the feet of the Lord of mercies for me, a miserable sinner.”‡

5. That Origen was of the same opinion as Catholics now are, relative to the lawfulness of invoking the Saints, is too evident to need any farther proof; but Messrs. Kirk and Berington adduce three lines more, from a work on Job, which they considered to be Origen's. In the extract, Origen is made to address himself to holy Job in this prayer: “Pray for us unfortunate creatures—that the mercies of the terrible God may deign to protect us in all our tribulations, and in the midst of the snares spread by our enemy.”—*Lib. ii. de Job.*

\* In the text, I have observed that all the writers on the works of Origen, referred to in the note p. 13, attest the authenticity of this work. The reader will be satisfied, perhaps, by referring to tom. ii. Ed. Bened. where the work is given as genuine,

† Euseb. Lib. vi. c. 24, p. 225.

‡ The *Philocalia* has preserved a small portion of this work. The *Philocalia* is entirely composed of extracts from the works of Origen, and was compiled by S. Gregory Nazianzen, and S. Basil the Great. It consists of passages from Origen's Homilies upon various books of the Old and New Testament, his book of Principles, and his books against Celsus. In it is also preserved entire the Epistle to S. Gregory Thaumaturgus.

That this prayer contains nothing opposed to the spirit of Origen's writings, is evident from the foregoing extracts. But, exclaims Mr. Keary, the passage is none of Origen's. That its authenticity is disputed I admit, that "Origen never wrote it," I am inclined to believe; but I cannot bring myself, after an examination of the evidence on both sides of the question, to pronounce dogmatically with the worthy Rector, that it *cannot have been* from that writer's pen. As the whole of Mr. Keary's account of Origen is highly graphic and characteristic, I place it before the reader. "He (Mr. Hampson) commenced with an eulogium on the learning, &c. of a writer of the third century, named Origen. I acquiesced in this, forgetting at the moment that he was condemned as a heretic by the fifth general council, as Bellarmine declares. (*Bell. de Scriptor. Eccles. Lovanii*, 1678, p. 60.) He then proceeded to read, when I was certainly rude enough to interrupt him, by asking what work of that author he was quoting, as I rather anticipated what would follow. He, after a little hesitation, replied, his Comment on Job; on which I said, that he never wrote that work, giving, as my authority for the assertion, three great critics of the Romish Church,—Du Pin, Possevin the Jesuit, and Sixtus Senensis, the Dominican.\* To the first he demurred, why, I cannot tell, as he lived and died a member, and was, indeed, the greatest ornament of his communion. I do not, however, feel inclined to repudiate this learned Sorbonist, at the mere dictum of the not equally learned, I presume, Collegiate of Ampleforth, but will, in addition, bring forward Bellarmine, the favorite champion of Rome. In his work on *Ecclesiastical Writers*, he says,—'That the three books on Job were not written by Origen, for this very plain reason, that they refer to many events and cir-

\* I have already given the character of two of the "great critics," referred to by Mr. Keary. As to the voluminous and superficial Du Pin, Mr. Keary ought not to have been surprised, if he knew anything of biography, at his authority, when adduced as that of a Catholic, being demurred at. The orthodoxy of Du Pin is, with reason, suspected. Has Mr. Keary never heard of his intimacy with Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, and of his intercepted correspondence with that prelate? Of his wish to abolish auricular confession; his desire that we should say nothing about transubstantiation; do away with religious vows; retrench such duties as fasting, abstinence, and the like; allow priests to marry; discard the Pope, &c.? Is he ignorant that there is reason for believing, that his practice was conformable to his doctrine, and that like Luther and the rest, he actually married, to shew the contempt in which he held laws ecclesiastical? Pope Clement XI gives him this character:—"C'est un homme d'une très mauvaise doctrine."



cumstances, such as the Council of Nice, and the controversies on the word consubstantial, thence arising, which occurred long after the death of this Father.'” There is much that is incorrect in this passage, and much in very bad taste. Of this latter kind, is his unmerited sneer at the Collegiate of Ampleforth; of the former, his assertion that Du Pin, Possevin, and Sixtus, are three *great* critics of the *Romish* Church;\* and his statement as to the orthodoxy of Du Pin. Most readers too will deem it strange that Mr. Keary should possibly anticipate, that of five passages given by Messrs. Kirk and Berington, the Catholic disputant would fix upon the shortest, and that not the most powerful of the extracts. It may also seem somewhat extraordinary to a mere reader of the pamphlet, that Mr. Hampson should merely have referred, as Mr. Keary leads us to conclude, to the only two of the passages about which even a whisper of suspicion has ever been heard. But be this as it may, and granting that Du Pin, Possevin, and Sixtus, give it as their opinion that the Books on Job, from which the extract is taken by the learned Editors of the *Faith of Catholics*,† are not genuine, does it therefore follow that these gentlemen were necessarily debarred from citing them? The real case is this: Origen wrote a *Comment*, and also, probably, *Homilies* on the *Book of Job*.‡ Two works, the writers of which are unknown, were discovered, and from the similarity of title, were thought to be Origen's. Upon a more careful examination, it has been imagined that they were not from his pen; certain observations seem to point to a later period, and perhaps to Arian origin. Thus S. Lucian, who suffered during the fourth century, is mentioned; the Manichees also are talked of; and certain passages are more Arian

\* Mr. Keary (page 5) rather thinks, from the exact coincidence of quotation, that his opponent “gleaned his knowledge at second-hand, from that great arsenal of modern controvertists, Berington and Kirk's book;” now I happen to have before me a curious, and, I fancy, a rather scarce book, which has upon it the dust of nearly two centuries, from which, if I were “to argue from the exact coincidence of quotation,” Mr. K. must have “gleaned his knowledge at second-hand.” If my surmise be unjust, and Mr. K. has not gleaned his knowledge from James's “*Bastardy of the False Fathers*,” pages 15 and 16, he will, no doubt, see that exact coincidence of quotation is not a perfectly safe evidence from which to draw a conclusion such as his.

† We have here another specimen of Mr. Keary's inaccuracy. The *Comment on Job* is the work which at the outset he tells us was cited by Mr. Hampson; and to shew that this work was cited unjustly as Origen's, he refers us to, and quotes a passage from Bellarmin, which speaks only of *The Three Books on Job*.

‡ *Hier. Ruf. lib. i. cap. i. p. 196.*



than any found in the writings of Origen hitherto discovered. However, powerful as may be these arguments, and such like, for there are others of a similar kind, they cannot be said to *decide* the question. They prove, indeed, that the work, if Origen's, must have been interpolated,—and this, we know, happened to no one's works more than to his,—but they do not afford proof evident that it may not be his. It has been adjudged to be his by many critics; and though Huet,† Tillemont,‡ and Lardner,§ reject it as spurious, not to mention the authors referred to by Mr. Keary, still there can be no reason why other critics, as Kirk and Berington, may not judge it to have merely suffered the fate of Origen's other works—a fate which many eminent critics believe the Scriptures themselves have not escaped—considerable interpolation. Had Mr. Keary looked at the question calmly, he would, no doubt, have been less dogmatical, and have seen that his own judgment ought to have been, that probably Origen did not write the work, but that still it *may be* his; and then his opinion would have coincided with that of Bellarmine, who does not say, as he translates him, that “the three Books on Job” *were not written*, but, *do not seem to have been written* by Origen. As Mr. Keary has sadly altered the whole passage of Bellarmine, I give it in a note.\* Moreover, had he read the other writers whom he has cited, he would have been less anxious to press the passage too forcibly on the attention of the reader; since he would have known, that if not Ori-

\* Even during his life-time, Origen, in a letter to his friends at Alexandria (*apud S. Hieron. lib. ii. contra Rufin. p. 413*) complains, that certain persons, willing to authorize their erroneous tenets by his name, had foisted many things into his writings. His works, in the fourth century, were cited by the Arians as containing opinions favourable to theirs, whilst, on the other hand, St. Athanasius, St. Basil, and St. Gregory Nazianzen, considered him orthodox on the question of the Divinity of the Son, and cited passages from his writings to that effect.

† *Huet. Origeniana*, pp. 273, 274.

‡ *Tillem. Mem. tom. iii. p. 562.*

§ *Lardner, Credit of Gospel*, tom. ii. p. 483.

\* *Libri tres in Job non videntur esse Originis; nam lib. 1, meminit Auctor Homousianorum, quam dicit esse sectam trium Deorum, quæ totum orbem replevit. At nomen Homousianorum inventum est ab Arianis, qui post obitum Originis apparuerunt. Deinde lib. 2, meminit Auctor S. Luciani jam tum martyrio affecti. At S. Lucianus posterior Origine fuit. De Script. Eccles. p. 56. Colonia Agripp. 1622.*

gen's, it at least is from a very early writer, probably one that flourished at the beginning of the fifth century.\*

III. St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, is next referred to in the "Faith of Catholics." From his writings two passages are extracted; the first from his fifty-seventh Epistle, and the second from his tract "On the Habit of Virgins."†

\* Eras. Prol. in Orig. pp. 25, 26.

The reader may be curious to know what was Du Pin's opinion with respect to Origen's sentiments on the Invocation of Angels and Saints. He says, observes Du Pin, (*Engl. Edit.* vol. i. p. 110) in several places, that the Angels take care of men, that every Church, every society, and lastly, every man, has his Angel guardian; and even in some places he says, every one has his good and evil angel. . . . Though he denies that we ought to address to the Angels the same prayers, and the same adorations, as to God, yet he allows "*that they may be prayed unto*, and honoured according as they deserve." In confirmation, Du Pin refers amongst other works to Origen's Homilies on *Numbers* and *Ezekiel*. At p. 114, in his Analysis of Origen's Treatise on Prayer, the same writer observes, that Origen taught, that "the Saints which are departed pray with us," (and this is one of the most ancient and excellent monuments to prove the intercession of Saints). His words are these:—"The souls of the Saints which sleep among the number of the just, pray with us, as it is said in the book of Maccabees. . . . And since the imperfect knowledge which we have in this world is made perfect in the other life, 'tis a very great absurdity not to believe the same thing of the other virtues, and principally charity towards our neighbour, which we ought to believe to be much stronger in the Saints than in mortal men, who are subject to weaknesses and imperfections." He adds, "that every faithful person has his Angel that hears him, and preserves him whilst he prays."

† St. Cyprian wrote the greatest portion, if not all his works, between the years 246 and 258. They are distributed into two parts; Tracts or Treatises, and Epistles. There are some of the latter, Montfaucon (*Diar. Ital. cap. v. p. 75*) tells us, still at Venice, unpublished. Some pieces have been ascribed to S. Cyprian which are not his; but neither the epistle nor the treatise referred to by Messrs. Kirk and Berington is of that number. Pamelius, Tillemont, and Pearson, think that the tract on the Habit of a Virgin was written a short time after he was consecrated bishop, but Dom Maran is of a contrary opinion. We have had several editions of this Father's works. The first edition, which appeared soon after the invention of printing, is extremely correct. Erasmus, Manutius at Rome, Morel at Paris, Pamelius, and Rigaltius, gave new editions of his works. The excellent Oxford edition appeared in 1682, with new notes by Dr. Fell, Pearson's *Annales Cyprianici*, and Dodwell's *Dissertations*. Baluze prepared a new edition, but did not live to publish it. D. Maran gave it to the world in an amended form; it is a specimen of exact and cautious criticism. We have also an edition of this Father in English, by Mr. N. Marshal, 1717.

In the Epistle, which is to Pope Cornelius, he thus addresses that holy Pontiff: "Let us be mindful of one another in our prayers; with one mind, and with one heart, in this world and in the next, let us always pray, with mutual charity relieving our sufferings and afflictions. And may the charity of him, who, by the divine favor, shall first depart hence, still persevere before the Lord; may his prayer, for our brethren and sisters, not cease." *Ep. LVII. p. 96.*

As Mr. Keary insinuates that this translation is incorrect, and gives another, which he declares to be the *literal* rendering of the passage, I shall place the original Latin before the reader, that he may be able to form a correct judgment. I must premise that I quote from the Oxford edition of St. Cyprian's works, which is considered more accurate than Rigault's, referred to by Mr. Keary. "*Memores nostri invicem simus, concordēs atque unanimēs, utrobique per nobis semper oremus, pressuras et angustias mutua charitate relevemus. Et quis istinc nostrum prior divinæ dignationis celebritate præcesserit, perseveret apud Dominum nostra dilectio, pro fratribus et sororibus nostris apud misericordiam Patris non cesset oratio.*"—*p. 143.*

The reader will now please to attend carefully to Mr. Keary's translation, which I give, together with all his remarks, on the evidence from this Father.

"His unsafe guides have led the Prior, in the case of Cyprian, into a *false translation*; which, had he looked into the original, he would have escaped, or most likely not have adduced a passage *which has so little bearing on his subject*. This letter is from the Bishop of Carthage to his *brother*, as he, with little idea of supremacy, calls him, Cornelius of Rome, then in banishment. The passage in question refers, as the Roman Catholic Commentator, in the copy of his works before me, Rigaltius, states, not to any intercession of *either after death*, but that the survivor of the two Christian friends, then daily expecting martyrdom, should not cease to pray for their persecuted Church. I must, however, place the *Romish* translation in contrast with the literal one, as an illustration of the usual mode of making an ancient writer support modern error. *Literal translation*:—"Let us be mindful of each other in our prayers; let us be concordant and unanimous; let us always mutually pray for one another; let us, by mutual charity, relieve our troubles and distresses; and whosoever, by the celerity of the divine favor, shall first depart, *let our love persevere with the Lord for our brethren and sisters*; let not our prayers *cease with the mercy of the Father*." This may be a literal, but the last two members of the sentence are not a very intelligible translation. But this is of



minor importance. If, reader, after this evidently careful examination of the passage, it can be shewn, that Mr. Keary has perverted the plain meaning of the text *by altering the punctuation of the passage*, and that he *has misstated the opinion* of Rigault, I will appeal to the judgment of the most zealous of his friends, whether he has not been guilty of an action which honesty and candour must blush at; and proceeded in a way with the documents of antiquity, which if he durst but attempt to extend to writings of less importance, affecting the temporal interests of mankind, would cause him to be shunned, and pointed at as an impostor. Now, by referring to the original, as given too, observe, in the margin to p. 16 of his own work, it will be seen at once, that after the word *dilectio* there is a comma, which divides this from the following member of the sentence, namely, from *pro nostris fratribus et sororibus*. This comma Mr. Keary has taken no notice of, and makes S. Cyprian say, *let our love persevere with the Lord for our brethren and sisters*,\* whilst the true meaning is, depending entirely, it must be noticed, on the position of the comma,—*let our love persevere with the Lord, and prayer cease not to our merciful Father for our brethren and sisters*. The meaning of S. Cyprian is exceedingly obvious—the passage need only be translated literally to be understood; and as Mr. Keary has favored the public with one version, I may be allowed to give another:—"Let us think of each other, be of one heart and one mind, and offer up at all times, mutual prayer for each other; and, by our mutual charity, relieve our afflictions and difficulties. And whichever shall, by the celerity of the divine bounty, depart this life before the other, *let our love still continue before the Lord, nor prayer cease to be offered up to a merciful Father † for our brethren and sisters*." It is plain that S. Cyprian means, that death ought to make no difference between them, and that they ought to continue to pray as before, though one may have passed to a happier life, for the members of their respective churches. So much for Mr. Keary's *literal* translation; now for his authority, the Roman Catholic Commentator, Rigaltius.

\* Even in this shameful perversion of evidence, Mr. K. is not original. In an edition of his works published in 1593, apud Joannem Le Preux, but without the name of the place, and which, from the preface, seems to be edited by the Calvinistic Minister, Simon Goulart, this plan of evading the force of the passage is mentioned, but he durst not, like Mr. Keary, introduce it into the text.

† *Apud misericordiam Patris*, which is an example of a well-known figure, *εν δια ένοιας*, is translated by Mr. Keary, by, "*with the mercy of the Father!*"



1. Like Du Pin, Rigault held opinions which no orthodox Catholic can defend.\* Even the Protestant Bishop, Dr. Fell, considered him to be a disguised Calvinist; and his notes upon Tertullian and S. Cyprian, undoubtedly often absurdly lean towards certain principles of that communion.†

2. Waiving this fresh specimen of Mr. Keary's unacquaintance with biography, let us proceed to examine what Rigault really says. And what will the reader think if Rigault, though we have the assertion of Mr. Keary for it, does not say that "it refers not to intercession after death." The words of Rigault are these: "Patet, inquit Pamelius, (another learned annotator on S. Cyprian,) ex hoc loco Cyprianum sensisse et credidisse *sanctos et defunctos pro vivis orare*. Ego quidem," says Rigault, "*hanc disciplinam Christiano dignissimam esse arbitror, sed ambiguum mihi videtur, an hoc sentiat Cyprianus*." That is to say, "Pamèle is of opinion, that it is clear, from this passage, that S. Cyprian thought and believed, that the saints, after death, pray for the living. Though I (Rigault) approve of this opinion, as highly worthy of a Christian, still *it seems to me doubtful*, whether this is the meaning of S. Cyprian." Rigault thought the meaning of the passage *doubtful*, and Mr. Keary has the presumption to state to the public, that that writer was unequivocally of opinion that the passage in question "refers not to any intercession of either after death."

It were to be wished, for Mr. Keary's sake, and for the sake of his flock, who, no doubt, are accustomed to look on him as a man incapable of an untruth, that it were possible he might have mistaken the passage, or "have gleaned his knowledge at second-hand:" but no, "the hand-writing is upon the wall," for he tells us that whilst writing, a copy of Rigault was before him.

It is clear, then, that the passage of S. Cyprian *is to the purpose*; that Mr. Keary's translation of that passage is "false"—the word is his own—and that the opinion which he ascribes to Rigault, to serve his purpose, was none of his.

Mr. Keary says nothing more about S. Cyprian; and by his silence the reader is left to suppose, as in the case of

\* One of his opinions would, I fancy, shock even the Protestantism of Mr. Keary. Rigault contended for a right and power in laymen to consecrate the Eucharist, in cases of necessity; this, and such like opinions, he industriously endeavours to support in his editorial remarks on Tertullian and S. Cyprian.

† On this subject, *vid. Albaspinæus, H. Grotius, Ep. ad Salmas. p. 323, and Petitdidier, in his excellent "Remarques sur la Bibliothèque de Du Pin, tom. 1.*

Origen, that Messrs. Kirk and Berington quote nothing but the passage which he objects to, from that Father; or, at all events, that if they do, that “it is nothing to the purpose.” But the Faith of Catholics gives another extract from the Bishop of Carthage, and that much more direct than the one discussed in the foregoing remarks. It is extracted, as I have already remarked, from his tract, “*De Habitu Virginum*.” It is thus translated: “Boldly endure, advance in spirit, arrive happily; then remember us, when the single state, which you have embraced, shall begin to be rewarded.”\*—*De Habitu Virg.* p. 181:

The passage speaks for itself, since it clearly refers† to that period when, after struggling boldly with the world and the flesh, the virgins shall have arrived at eternal happiness;—there too, as when on earth, S. Cyprian begs the virgins’ prayers, and bids them remember him in the kingdom of their God.

IV. Eusebius, the learned Bishop of Cæsarea, is next cited by the Faith of Catholics. On the passages extracted, Mr. Keary passes the following censure: “The next author, I think, taking Berington as my guide, was Eusebius, on the Psalms and Isaiah. Of these works, both Possevin and Du Pin declare, that they were written by some later writer; in this Bellarmine agrees, for he does not even so much as name them in the list of this Father’s productions.”

We have here, reader, another specimen of the candour of the Rev. Rector. A man of ordinary understanding would conclude, from the above statement, that Messrs. Kirk and Berington had quoted nothing from Eusebius but two extracts from his commentaries on Isaiah and the Psalms. But he will find himself deceived in judging from the ordinary use of language, of the meaning attached to it by Mr. Keary. His is no ordinary mind, nor is his language cast in the ordinary mould of human parlance, but suited to that extraordinary acumen which led him to discover, that *of forty-two passages cited “by Berington and Kirk’s book,” twenty-two are palpable forgeries*. As Mr. Keary has not chosen to mention the whole of the passages cited by the learned authors whose labours he so unaccountably attempts to depre-

\* Tantem mementote tunc nostri, cum incipiet in vobis virginitas honorari.

† The context puts this beyond the possibility of doubt. The words in the extract are the last of the treatise, and will remind the reader of the termination of Tertullian’s treatise on the veiling of virgins. The words that deserve particular attention, as decisive of the question, are the almost immediately preceding ones—‘*major et meliore parte præceditis.*’

ciate, I am compelled to supply the deficiency. But I must appeal to the candour and judgment of the reader, whether, by suppressing all mention of the passages which are clearly from the works of Eusebius, to fly to flippant comments on others, which he is pleased to tell us certain critics declare not to be from that historian's pen, Mr. Keary does not betray a consciousness of the badness of his cause, or rather of that particular view of it which, in his chivalrous spirit, he has chosen to take, by contending that the Fathers did not believe, in those early and pure ages, as the Catholic now does?

Messrs. Kirk and Berington cite four several passages from the learned historian of Cæsarea; two from his "History" and "Preparation," and two others from the works of which the authenticity is denied by Mr. Keary.

I. The first passage is from an invaluable work, which no one has ever suspected to be spurious,\* namely, the well-known "*Preparatio Evangelica*." It is translated as follows: "Plato observes, that those who nobly die in battle, shall be venerated as heroes, and their monuments be renowned.—How well does this apply to the deaths of those friends of God, who are justly called the soldiers of genuine piety! For it is our practice to honor their sepulchres—there to utter our prayers, and our vows, and to venerate their blessed souls;† and this we say is justly done." *Præpar. Evangel. L. XIII. c. XI. p. 663. Coloniae.*

The "Evangelical Preparation" being undoubtedly the work of Eusebius, I need not dwell any longer on the passage extracted from it, which evidently is highly illustrative, and confirmatory of the antiquity of the Catholic practice.

II. The second passage is extracted from a comment on the 78th Psalm, and runs thus: "We indeed have not been deemed worthy to fight to the last, and to spill our blood for the Lord; but because we are the children of those who thus died, clothed, as it were, with their virtue, we pray to find mercy through them, saying: Be propitious, O God, to the children of the slain." *Comment. in Psal. LXXVIII. T. I. p. 487. N. Collect. Montfaucon. Ed. Paris. 1706.*

That this passage is a direct testimony in favor of our doctrine, and even an actual prayer to the saints departed, is clear;

\* For an account of this writer's works, vide *H. Valesii de Vit. et Scriptis Eusebii Cæsar. Tillem. Mém. T. VII. Eusèbe, Art. v—VIII. Cave, H. L. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. v. c. 4. T. VI. p. 30. Lardner, Cred. of Gosp. Vol. IV. Art. Euseb. p. 72—79.*

† Τας ευχας παρα ταυταις ποιένσθαι, τιμαντε τας μακαρας αυτων-ψυχας.



but the work from which it is extracted, Mr. Keary tells us, is not genuine. In confirmation of this assertion, he refers us to Du Pin, Possevin, and Bellarmin; who, he assures us, were of opinion that the work is spurious. Now, what will be the indignation and astonishment of the reader to learn that this is utterly 'false.' He will not, perhaps, be surprised to find, that it is also a fresh proof of the total ignorance shewn by Mr. Keary of any thing that has been done, in the department of ecclesiastical research and learning, for the last century. The character of his favorite critics, Du Pin and Possevin, has been already given; and the reader will remember that the former died in 1719, the latter in 1611, and Bellarmin in 1621. Now, reader, observe, that the Commentary on the Psalms, referred to by Messrs. Kirk and Berington, was first discovered by the indefatigable Montfaucon, who published it at Paris, down to the 119th Psalm, in 1705! So that, two of his authorities at least, Possevin and Bellarmin, had long slept with their fathers, before this valuable treasure was discovered. Really it would be amusing to know what studies occupy the attention of the Rector of Nunnington. He knew not that the writings of Ephraim had been discovered;\* and he seems equally ignorant of the discovery, made by the learned Montfaucon, of a part of the Commentary written by Eusebius on the Psalms, and his exposition of the prophecy of Isaiah. And yet this, every tyro in ecclesiastical reading was well acquainted with. Lardner, in his immortal work on the "Credibility of the Gospel Testimony," has made the fact as common as a "household word." But the Rector of Nunnington has no doubt other avocations. Why then has he the presumption to come forward as an impugner of the authenticity of works cited by men, who are evidently as far superior to Mr. Keary in ecclesiastical knowledge, as in sincerity?

Having disposed of his pretended argument from the authority of Possevin and Bellarmin, I need add but little relative to Du Pin. The reader well knows that Du Pin had written and published his account of Eusebius as early as 1686, that is, nearly twenty years before Montfaucon made his valuable discovery. Even though Du Pin had had an opportunity of passing judgment on the work in question, had that judgment been opposed by the superior discernment of Montfaucon, it would have received but little attention in the literary world. In fact, as well might the fly presume to give battle to the elephant, as the flimsy and puny Du Pin, to oppose that giant of criticism, the industrious and unwearied Montfaucon.

But there is, in fact, no difference of opinion between them ; and, what is more, there could not be ; for there is not the slightest reason for doubting, that the commentary published by Montfaucon, was written by Eusebius.\* The authenticity of this passage once established, the conformity of the present, with the early opinions of the Church, on this question, remains for ever established.

One more remark on Du Pin's testimony. This writer, so far from pretending, as Mr. Keary would make him, that we are not in possession of Eusebius's Notes on the Psalms, may, perhaps, be considered as having led the way to the important discovery of that work. Had Mr. Keary not merely been contented with naming Du Pin, but actually referred to his writings, he would have seen, that *that critic was aware that an unpublished MS. containing some portion at least of that work, was preserved at Florence.*†

III. The third passage is from Eusebius on Isaiah, and is comprised in little more than one line. "May we be found worthy by the prayers and intercession of all the Saints."‡ *Comm. in Isai. tom. II, p. 593.* That this passage is to the purpose is obvious, and its authenticity is equally certain. This work too, was first published by Montfaucon ; and, consequently, as Mr. Keary impugns its genuineness on the same grounds as the preceding, he sees this passage vindicated, and bearing its evidence against him.§

IV. The last extract is from the work which has obtained for Eusebius the title of Father of Ecclesiastical History. "In many parts of his History," say the Editors of the "Faith of Catholics," "Eusebius speaks of the honor shewn to the relics and memories of the martyrs. And, in recounting the death of Basilides, he mentions that the Virgin Patamiæna, had thus addressed him, when she was near her end: "Be of good heart, Basilides ; for, when I am dead, *I will obtain thy*

\* S. Jerome mentions this work in his catalogue of Eusebius's writings: "Edidit in centum quinquaginta Psalmos eruditiss.commen." *Hieron. de V. J. c. 81.* Lardner, in his account of the writings of this Father, mentions this work in the following terms, under No. 27, page 78, Tom. IV: "A commentary upon the 150 Psalms, mentioned and commended by Jerome in his Catalogue, *but wanting in late ages, till Montfaucon, in the year 1705, published it as far as the 119th Psalm.* This learned writer thinks that it was written one of the last of his works, probably in 326 or 327."

† Du Pin, tom. II. 23. *Engl. Edit. tom. II. p. 8.* See also, Tillemont *Mémoires, tom. VII. p. 64.*

‡ Ευχαίς και πρεσβείαις παντων των αγιων.

§ Vid. Montfaucon, *Edit. Paris. 1705.* Lardner, tom. IV. p. 79.

salvation from the Lord,\* and thus repay the favors which I have received from thee.” *Hist. Eccles. l. vi. c. v. p. 263.* Basilides, in whose favor the Holy Martyr promises to interest herself, was one of her executioners; who, a short time afterwards, was converted to the Christian faith, and died a martyr to his belief. “And when, (continues Eusebius, *l. c.*) asked by certain Christians the cause of his sudden and unlooked for conversion, he is said to have replied, that, three days after her holy martyrdom, the virgin Patamiæna appeared to him, in the dead of night, and placing a crown upon his head, assured him that she had prayed for him to the Lord, who had deigned to hearken to her supplication,—and that he (Basilides) would ere long be called to the happiness of heaven.”

V. S. Athanasius, G. C. “He then quotes (says Mr. Keary)† Athanasius’s Sermon on the Annunciation. Bellarmin avers, that it was never written by this Father, but by some uncertain writer, after the year 681, or 300 years after the decease of its supposed author.”

Mr. Keary, even when appearances are most in his favor, destroys the force of his argument, by saying more than the real facts of the case warrant. Messrs. Kirk and Berington refer to St. Athanasius’s Sermon *on the Annunciation*, Bellarmin to a discourse entitled *de Sanctissima Deipara Maria*, that is, on *the most holy Mother of God*. His words, referred to by Mr. Keary, are these: “*Sermo de Sanctissima Deipara Maria, non videtur esse S. Athanasii, sed alicujus posterioris qui post concilium tertium, et quartum, imo etiam sextum floruerit.*”—“The sermon *on the most holy Mother of God*, does *not seem* to be from the pen of S. Athanasius, but from that of some later writer, who lived after the third or fourth, or even after the sixth general council.” Now, by what process of reasoning does Mr. Keary conclude, that, because Bellarmin declares that a sermon on the blessed Virgin is probably spurious, that this particular sermon *on the Annunciation* is the one censured by the learned Cardinal. If no other sermon on the Virgin Mary was to be found ascribed to S. Athanasius, this might be correct, though even in that case, a careful reasoner, who did not despise the ordinary mode of argument, would tell us so. But it so happens, that the very next discourse to the contested sermon on the Annun-

\* Εξαίτησθαι αὐτον ἀπελθεσαν παρὰ τῇ εαυτῆς Κυρίῳ.

† Page 13. For an account of this Father’s life and writings, vide *Pagi Ann.* 326, n. 3. 372, n. 9—11. *Basnag. Ann.* 373, n. 9, *Cave. H. L. Athan. Vita a Bened. Adornata. Tillem. Mém. tom. viii. Alban Butler, vol. v. p. 40.*



ciation, is on another event of the life of the B. Virgin. However, be it granted that Bellarmin had this particular sermon in view, still, first, he does not aver, as Mr. Keary says he does, that it was not written by the saint, but simply that it *seems* not to be his. Secondly, had Mr. Keary but the slightest acquaintance with the discussions on questions of Ecclesiastical History, which have passed between the learned, he would have known, that a critical controversy existed between two no less men than Baronius and Stapleton, as to the authenticity of this very sermon. Baronius contended that it was spurious, Stapleton denied it. Mr. Keary might have learned, had he known this, to be more cautious in pronouncing, so dogmatically, on the spuriousness of a work, which men, far more learned than himself, have only doubted of, and others have maintained to be genuine.

Knowing this to be the real state of the case, Messrs. Kirk and Berington were surely as much at liberty to defend and make use of the sermon, as Mr. Keary to impugn it. Will Mr. Keary find fault with this? I know not: but of this I am sure, that Bellarmin considered the authority of this sermon to be so far probable, as to justify an appeal to it. This, in fact, he himself does, citing, besides the passage referred to in the "Faith of Catholics," several other extracts from it.\*

Thirdly, even granting that the sermon is spurious, still, if the first of Bellarmin's suppositions be correct, it would be the testimony of some unknown writer of the fourth century, and the passage be as valuable, as a record of the belief of the times, as if drawn from the perfectly authentic works of that Father. And even, if written after the sixth General Council, it still falls within the period which many learned Protestants have declared to be anterior to the introduction of the Invocation of Saints; and, as such, furnishes valuable evidence against those writers.

The passage is as follows:—"Hear now, O daughter of David; incline thine ear to our prayers. We raise our cry to thee. Remember us, most holy Virgin, and for the feeble eulogiums we give thee, grant us great gifts from the treasures of thy graces, thou who art full of grace. Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Queen and Mother of God, intercede for us."—*Serm. in Annunt. t. II. p. 401.*

Mr. Keary next tells us, "that to go through the whole of the forty quotations of Berington and Kirk, would far exceed his allotted space, and that a few, therefore, must suffice as a specimen."† Accordingly, armed at all points with the learn-

\* Vide *Bell. De Beatit. Sanct. Lib. I. c. XIX.*

† Page 13.

ing of Mr. Oxlee, "whose acquaintance with Oriental literature," he tells us, "is well known,"\*—and supported by the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* of Assemani, he flies from S. Athanasius to S. Ephrem, leaving the quotations from the works of S. James of Nisibis, and other Fathers, untouched. When Mr. Keary shall have read my remarks on his observations on S. Ephrem, I flatter myself that he will think that I have come to that writer's testimony soon enough, even though I proceed in the course which I have traced out for myself, and examine the intervening passages one by one.

From writers of the Greek, "the Faith of Catholics" passes to one of the same century in the Latin Church,—the venerable convert to Christianity, Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers. This writer, even in his youth, was reckoned amongst the most learned men of his age. We are presented with two extracts, both taken from a commentary on the Psalms, a work, the genuineness of which, Mr. Keary must know, is undoubted.† In turning from page 13 to page 16, of Mr. Keary's lucubrations, I find that he has been kind enough to give us his opinion of these passages in these few words:—"His references to Hilary on the Psalms, are of a similar description: [he alludes to the extracts from S. Cyprian] the train of the writer's argument in the context, which is far too long to quote, refers to the guardianship (or overlooking) of angels; for which he quotes *Hebrews*, i. 14. These he somewhat fancifully likens to those mountains round about Jerusalem; (*Psalm* CXXIX. *our version*, CXXX.) but of prayer to them, or any other created being, he gives not the most distant intimation." And is this really all that S. Hilary does?—The reader shall judge for himself.

I. "To them that wish to stand, there is not wanting *the custody of Saints*, nor the guardianship of Angels.‡ And lest we might think lightly of the protection of Apostles, Patriarchs, and Prophets, or rather of Angels, who surround, with a certain ward, the Church, it is added in the Psalm, *the Lord is round about his people. He is with us.*" *Comment. in Psalm. CXXIV. p. 604.*

To this passage Mr. Keary's remarks are confined: yet would not the reader naturally conclude that they extend to both extracts? We have seen too many instances of a similar

\* Page 6.

† S. Hilary flourished about the year 354. S. Jerome mentions this commentary on the Psalms. *Hieron. de Vir. Ill. cap. 100.* See *Lardner*, tom. iv. p. 178. *Alban Butler*, vol. i. p. 166-8. *Bellarmin. de Scrip. Eccles. p. 84-6.*

‡ Sanctorum custodiæ, neque Angelorum munitiones.

disingenuousness, to be surprised at another repetition of it here.

As to the passage itself, the reader has no doubt observed that S. Hilary does not refer merely *to the guardianship of Angels*, as Mr. Keary pretends, but also *to the custody of the Saints*, as a means of defending those who wish to stand, from falling into the snares of the enemy of their souls. If this be not to establish the lawfulness of invoking the protection of the saints, it certainly assures us that Hilary thought we are justified *in looking to them for protection*. But the context! What then? can the context prove that *Saint*, as distinguished from *Angel* in the very words before us, does not mean Saint, but Angel? or that the Apostles, Patriarchs, and Prophets, are nothing but Angels, in the language of the holy Bishop? If it cannot shew this, in vain does Mr. Keary appeal to it. However, his motive in doing so, is quite obvious—it is a shuffle to withdraw the attention of the reader from the plain force of the passage. By filling his page with such unworthy observations as these—that Hilary likens the Angels to mountains; that the context, if not too long, would decide the passage against the meaning ascribed to it by the “Faith of Catholics,” and the like; he thought that the reader might consider the passage as one of those allegorical interpretations of the sacred text, which the early writers loved so much to indulge in. Now, the real fact is, that few passages could possibly be extracted less independent of the context. S. Hilary gives a running comment on the different verses of the Psalm, and thus obviously his remarks must be, as they are, quite detached, and perfectly independant of each other. That S. Hilary, therefore, does not merely speak of the Angels is obvious; that the context does not affect the plain meaning of the passage, Mr. Keary must know; and even if angels alone had been mentioned in the extract, I cannot see what advantage would be gained by the critical Rector. Had he only looked at the head of the page, he would have seen, that Messrs. Kirk and Berington had in view, not only to establish the Invocation of Saints, but also that of Angels.

II. The second extract is more full and decisive. In it we see that S. Hilary believed as Catholics now do, that the Angels offer up our prayers to God, and that “our infirmity stands in need of their powerful intercession.”—“We recollect, that there are many spiritual powers, who are called Angels, or who preside over Churches—and as the Lord teaches, the Angels of the little ones always see God. According to Raphael, speaking to Tobias, there are Angels that serve before the face of God, and who convey to him the



prayers of the suppliant.\* It is not the character of the Deity that stands in need of this intercession, but our infirmity does.† They are sent for the sake of those who shall inherit salvation: God is not ignorant of anything which we do; but the weakness of men, to supplicate and to obtain, calls for the ministry of spiritual intercession." *In Psalm. cxxix. p. 439, 440.*

VI. S. Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem, the amiable Confessor of the Greek Church, is next adduced. On the unanswerable passage extracted from this Father's works, Mr. Keary has not deigned to pass even one solitary word of comment. The catechetical and mystagogical discourses of S. Cyril‡ contain so clear an exposition of almost every doctrine that distinguishes the Catholic from the Protestant Church, that no stone has been left unturned, to cast, if possible, a doubt on their genuineness. But this attempt has proved fruitless; and Protestant, as well as Catholic critics have edited his works, and admitted, that, not only no solid argument, but not even a probable presumption, can be raised against their authenticity. This question being settled, I need only cite the passage for the reader to be convinced that S. Cyril, in the fourth, and the Catholic Church, in the nineteenth century, agree in opinion on this subject:—"Having stated," say Messrs. Kirk and Berington, "the doctrine of the Church on the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, as already quoted, and the form of the holy sacrifice, the Saint proceeds:—'Now when this spiritual sacrifice is ended, and this unbloody worship over the victim of propitiation, we

\* *Et orationes deprecantium ad Deum deferentes.*

† *Intercessione itaque horum non natura Dei egit, sed infirmitas nostra.*

‡ St. Cyril preached every year a course of catechetical sermons for the instruction of the Catechumens, to prepare them for baptism and the holy communion; only those which he preached in 348 are extant. These consist of eighteen to the *competentes* or *Illuminati*, that is, catechumens before baptism, and of five mystagogic catechetical discourses; so called, either because they were addressed to the catechumens immediately after they were initiated in the holy mysteries of baptism, confirmation, and the Eucharist, or because those sacraments are fully explained in them, which were never expounded to those who were not initiated according to the well known *disciplina arcani*, or discipline of the secret. These works are proved to be S. Cyril's, by Dr. Carr, in *S. Cyril's Life*; Thomas Milles, in his *Preface and Notes to his edition of S. Cyril*; by Whittaker, Vossius, Bull, &c. See also *Lardner, tom. iv. p. 171-2. Tillemont, Mem. tom. viii. 436-8. Bellarm. de Script. Eccles. p. 87, 88. Alban Butler, vol. iii. p. 201*, and particularly Toutée, the Maurist Monk, in the *Notes to his valuable and complete edition of this Father's works.*

supplicate God for the common peace of the Churches, for the tranquillity of the world, for kings, for their enemies, and their allies, for the sick and the afflicted; and, in a word, we pray, and offer this sacrifice for all who want assistance. We next commemorate those who are gone before us; the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs; *begging that, through their prayers, God would receive their supplications.\** We then pray for the *holy Fathers and Bishops that are dead, and for all the faithful departed, believing that their souls receive very great relief by the prayers that are offered for them while this holy and tremendous victim lies upon the altar.*" *Catech. Myst.* v. n. VIII. IX. p. 327, 328.

I would recommend, if he would allow me, the whole of this discourse to the perusal of the Rev. Rector. He will find in it an explanation of a part of our present liturgy, called the Preface, and also of a considerable portion of the prayers of the Mass, which are there shewn to be as old as S. Cyril. He will there find, that the holy sacrifice was then, as now, offered up for the dead, and that then, as now, S. Cyril had to explain to his followers how this sacrifice could be of use to the dead. "You ask me," says he, *l. c.* "of what use can prayer be when offered up for the departed souls, whether those souls left this world in a state of sin or grace?" I must refer him to the answer of S. Cyril, as to give the passage would be entering on another head of controversy. However, to give an edge to his curiosity, I may be allowed to tell him, that he will find S. Cyril teaching on this point, what Protestants are pleased to call the monstrous innovations and errors of Popery. But to return to the foregoing extract,—it cuts keenly at many favorite theories of the reformed Church. It asserts the belief in an *unbloody sacrifice*, teaches the *efficacy and lawfulness of prayer and sacrifice for the dead*, and exhorts to a holy reliance *on the intercession of the Saints in Heaven.*

VII. S. Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, is the next evidence brought forward by the "Faith of Catholics." From his Homily on the forty Martyrs, a passage of exquisite feeling is given, which, in a rich variety of phrase, establishes beyond controversy, that the opinion of this eloquent prelate was like our own. In celebrating the feast of the forty Martyrs, he thus addresses his hearers;—"These are they, who, having taken possession of our country, stand as towers against the incursions of the enemy. Here is a ready aid to Christians. Often have you endeavoured, often have you

\* ὁπως ο θεος ταις ευκαις αυτων και πρεσβειας προσδεχεται ημων την δεησιν.

toiled, to gain an intercessor. You have now forty, all emitting one common prayer.\* Who is oppressed by care, flies to their aid, as does he that prospers: the first, to seek deliverance; the second, that his good fortune may continue. The pious mother is found praying for her children; and the wife for the return of the health of her husband. O ye common guardians of the human race, co-operators in our prayers, most powerful messengers, stars of the world and flowers of Churches, let us join our prayers with yours."† *Hom. xix. in 40 Martyres, t. II. p. 155-6.* If this passage be genuine, there cannot possibly be a doubt of the opinion of this eloquent Bishop. As many writings have been ascribed to Basil, which are certainly not his, may not this be one of that number? "Many writings," says Lardner,‡ "have been ascribed to Basil without ground. For which reason, divers learned moderns, have taken commendable pains in distinguishing the spurious from the genuine. In which service, none, I think, have excelled Julian Garnier, the Benedictine editor of S. Basil's works."§ What then is the judgment of this learned editor on the Homily quoted. In his Preface, he enters at full length into an examination of all the homilies of which any doubt has ever been entertained; but, observe, this is not one of that number. It is, therefore, in his judgment, genuine, and is given as such in his second volume. In this all the writers referred to in the margin agree; in fact, its authenticity was never for a moment doubted.||

The reader will perceive, of himself, why Mr. Keary omitted all notice of this valuable extract.

VIII. S. James of Nisibis. The writings of this Father were first published entire at Rome, in 1766, with a transla-

\* συμφωνον ἀναπεμποντες προσευχην.

† ω κοινοι φυλακες του γενους των ανθρωπων! δεησεως σονεργοι, πρεσβευται δυνατωτατοι, αδτερες της οικουμένης, ανθητων εκκλησιων.

‡ It is generally supposed that S. Basil, commonly called the great, was born in Cappadocia, in the year 328 or 329. Besides the writers referred to by Lardner, for an account of his life and writings, Vide *Cave, H. L. Pagi, Ann.* 369, xvi. 370, ix. x. xxiii. 378, ii. *Basnag. A.* 370, n. vi. &c. 380, n. 8, 9. *Fabr. Bib. Gr. t. viii. p. 69. Du Pin, t. ii, p. 154. Tillem. Mem. t. ix. Butler, SS. Lives, vol. vi. p. 209.*

§ Lardner, vol. iv. p. 279. The Maurist Monk's edition appeared in 1721, but the last volume, with the life of the Saint, was published by Leo Marant, in 1730.

|| To avoid all possibility of cavil, it may be well to observe, that the last words of the text, "let us join our prayers with yours," which, however, do not affect the value of the passage, are not in the Benedictine edition.



tion from the Armenian, by Nicholas Antonelli, into the Latin language. The edition of this scholar is a masterly specimen of profound criticism and learning, to which I must refer Mr. Keary for proof of the authenticity of the works ascribed to this venerable prelate. The passage extracted in the "Faith of Catholics," is from a Sermon on Prayer. The writer is illustrating the words of the sacred text, (*Matt. v. 23.*) "therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar," which are incidentally introduced into his discourse. "Let not then the hatred which thou hast against any one, re-enter thy mind. For be assured, that thy prayer will be left before the altar, and that he [the angel of God] *will neither receive, nor raise it from the earth, whose office it is:* for he examines whether thy gift be polluted. If thy prayer be pure, he raises and offers it in the sight of God. Should he find thee, saying, in thy prayer, forgive me, for I forgive; thus will he say, first forgive thy debtor, and then I will raise thy prayer to God, whose debtor thou art." *Serm. iv. p. 72.*

Mr. Keary will find a similar passage at page 38, of this Father's works.\*

IX. S. Ephrem. We now come to the poet of the Eastern Church, Ephraim, the Deacon of Edessa. The Rector of Nunington must be particularly delighted, if we may judge from the length of his observations, at the mention of this Father. In the course of the "Ampleforth Controversy," he stops any appeal to S. Ephrem's evidence, and triumphs over his adversary by denying the very existence of his works in the language in which they were originally composed, indebted, he tells us, for this precious piece of information, to his favorite Du Pin. As Mr. Keary is particularly ingenious in his narration of this matter, I shall not swerve from the course which I have hitherto followed of giving his observations in his own words. "I gladly," he tells us, page 6, "avail myself of this opportunity to correct an inaccuracy respecting the alleged authorities of Mr. H., into which I inadvertently fell, and which, had I been permitted, it was my intention to have acknowledged on the Monday evening. I denied the validity of a reference to an author named Ephrem, a Syrian Deacon,

\* Lardner does not seem to have been acquainted with this writer's works, otherwise he would, no doubt, have made use of the valuable assistance they offered him. In fact, it may be doubted whether there are six copies of his works in England. The two elder Assemani place his death in 338; Tillemont and Ceillier, with more probability, in 350. His discourses are mentioned by Gennadius, (who gives their titles, *t. ii. p. 901, Op. S. Hier. Veron. An. 1735*) and commended by S. Athanasius, *Ep. Encycl. ad Episcop. Egypt. et Lyb.*

on the ground that, as his original writings were lost,\* and we knew them only through the uncertain medium of a second-hand translation, no great dependance could be placed on any thing ascribed to it: stating as my authority for the assertion, the Roman Catholic Historian and Critic, Du Pin. To my very learned friend, Mr. Oxlee, however, I am indebted for a more correct view of the subject; his well-known acquaintance with Oriental literature, rendering him familiar with a circumstance, which my ignorance in such lore, precluded my ascertaining, namely, that since the time of Du Pin, the original Syriac of Ephraim was discovered in the Vatican Library, by *Assaman*, [Assemani] and published by him at Rome." Mr. Keary, gentle reader, deserves thy mite of praise for his candour. He acknowledges his precipitancy and mistake, confesses his obligation, in good set terms, to Mr. Oxlee; intimates that his ignorance of *such lore* as Oriental literature, hindered him from knowing that the original Syriac of *an author, named Ephraim, a Syrian Deacon*, had been found in the Vatican Library; and, moreover, informs the world, that it is indebted for the discovery, to Assemani, who laid the invaluable treasure open to the public, by publishing it at Rome. This too, no doubt, Mr. Keary believes was done in the "Bibliotheca Orientalis," for he tells us, in the words which follow those given above, that "he *fears* that his blunder will not add anything available to Mr. Hampson's authorities, as he would, he doubts not, have quoted,—as given by Berington and Kirk,—two passages of this author; one from a homily in praise of the Virgin, and another in praise of all the Martyrs. On referring, however, for information respecting the writings of Ephraim, to the Bibliotheca Orientalis, in Mr. Oxlee's valuable library, we [Keary and Oxlee] found those two works placed among the spurious addenda of later ages."

Now, reader, either Mr. Oxlee is not the proficient in Oriental lore, which his indiscreet friend, Mr. Keary, would induce us to believe, or he had not a very apt scholar in the Rector of Nunnington. This, I think, will appear evident, when the following remarks on the writings of S. Ephrem, shall have been compared with the account sketched by Mr. Keary.

S. Ephrem, or Ephraim, called the Syrian, was born at or near Nisibis, a strong city on the banks of the Tigris, in

\* Does Mr. Keary know that S. Matthew, most likely, wrote his Gospel in Hebrew? If then we have that Gospel *through the uncertain medium of a translation*, will he tell us, *that no great dependance can be placed on anything ascribed to it?*

Mesopotamia. It seems probable that he was a disciple of S. James of Nisibis,\* who undoubtedly was his patron and spiritual director.† Several of S. Ephrem's works were translated into latin, and published at Rome in 1589, but not finished till 1597, by Gerard Vossius or Volkers, provost of Torgres. A greek edition was printed at Oxford in 1709, by Mr. Edward Thwaites. Dr. Joseph Assemani, after throwing a good deal of light on the history and works of this Father, in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, assisted in publishing a much more complete edition of his writings in six folio volumes, edited between the years 1732 and 1747.‡ Cardinal Querini, librarian of the Vatican, and F. Peter Benedetti, a Maronite Jesuit, had a considerable share in the labour of that production; so much so, that it may be said to have been almost the fruit of the exertions of the Jesuit, whose real name was Ambarach. This splendid work owed its origin to the same source as so many others,—the princely liberality of the Roman Pontiff. This Syrian Deacon, named Ephraim, as Mr. Keary superciliously styles him, is styled by his countrymen *the prophet of the Syrians, the harp of the Holy Ghost, the eloquent mouth, the column of the Church*. He has been named too the *Syriac Chrysostome*.

Such is S. Ephrem, and such the real account of his works. “But,” says Mr. Keary, “Mr. H. would, no doubt, have quoted, as given by Kirk and Berington, two passages from this writer: one, from a homily *in Praise of the Virgin*; and the second, from another homily *in Praise of the Martyrs*.” We have already seen Mr. Keary, in the case of Origen, omitting to mention quotations of acknowledged authenticity and value, and representing the matter in a way, that would necessarily induce the ordinary reader to conclude, that the passages which he condemned,

\* Jacobus, cognomento Magnus, natus Nisibi—ad episcopatum Nisibis erectus fuit, ubi sanctum *Ephræm Auditorem habuit*. *Jos. Assem. Bib. Or. t. i. p. 17.*

† For an account of the particulars of his life, vide *Cave Hist. Lit. t. i. p. 235, &c. Basnage, ann. 375, n. vi. and 380, n. x. Fabricius, Bib. Gr. l. v. c. 2, t. v. p. 319, &c. Assemani, Bib. Orient. c. vi. p. 24, &c. Tilem. t. viii.*

‡ After the publication of this edition of his works, a Latin translation of all his pieces, whether preserved in the original Syriac, or only in the old Greek version, was edited at Venice, 1775. I would refer Mr. Keary to Assemani's Preface and Prolegomena to this work; in which this truly learned orientalist gives an account of the various editions of S. Ephraim's works, and *discusses the authenticity of every piece*. When he shall have read this, he will know something more than he now does of the author, named Ephrem.



were the only ones cited in the *Faith of Catholics*. Unfortunately for the character of the Rector, he is here again at his dirty work. Would not any one reasonably suppose, that Mr. Hampson had no choice, if he made use of the *Faith of Catholics*, but to adduce the two quotations, to which Mr. Keary refers? Undoubtedly, he would; and yet, what will be the surprise of the reader to learn, that there is a third passage, of greater length and importance than the other two, so dogmatically pronounced, by the Rector of Nunnington, to be spurious? What claim can any writer have to be believed, after systematically,—for it runs through the whole of Mr. Keary's pamphlet,—having recourse to such low cunning? I shall supply the defect occasioned by the Rector's silence, but shall first attempt to account for it. With the help of Mr. Oxlee, “he refers for information respecting the writings of Ephrem, to the *Bibliotheca Orientalis*.” In doing this, he could not have overlooked Assemani's defence of the authenticity of the work from which the last quotation is taken, and, by a disingenuous and unworthy silence, he suppresses the evidence, and confines his animadversions to the two first passages, though of comparatively less importance. Assemani, both in the Oriental Library,\* and in his preliminary remarks† to the Venetian edition of S. Ephrem's works, clearly shews, that both the “*Reprehension and Confession*,” are the genuine production of that writer.‡ From this tract, we have the following valuable evidence:—“I pray to the saints; but that their prayers for me will be heard, I doubt. For the prophet Ezechiel has said (xiv. 20), that neither Noah, nor Job, nor Daniel, though they pray, shall obtain. I implore all the prophets: but I may be rejected, I fear, like those impious Israelites, of whom the Lord said to Jeremiah, (vii. 16) *pray not for this people*.” In *Repreh. & Confess. tom. i. p. 129*. This evidently shews that S. Ephrem supports the Catholic opinion; but is it not acknowledged, at all events, by Assemani, that the two first extracts are “from the spurious addenda of later ages”? That we have the Rector of Nunnington's words for it I admit, but this, I have learned, by past experience, is no certain proof. In fact, both the Encomium on all the Martyrs, the first work referred to by Messrs. Kirk and Berington, and the address in praise of the B. Virgin are, in Assemani's opinion, genuine. In proof of this, I refer to that writer's “Prolegomena” to the works of S. Ephrem. It will there be found, that there is not merely one address in praise of the B. Virgin, as Mr. Keary seems to fancy, but

\* *Tom. i. p. 141, 151.*

† *Tom. i. Proleg. p. 10.*

‡ *Assem. Proleg. in Edit. Venet. pp. 110, 111.*

many. Assemani enters into lengthened arguments to shew the authenticity of each. I refer to the learned linguist in the margin, to shew his opinion of the particular homily mentioned in the *Faith of Catholics*. The translation of the extract is as follows:—"We fly to thy patronage, Holy Mother of God; protect and guard us under the wings of thy mercy and kindness. Most merciful God, through the intercession of the most blessed Virgin Mary, and of all the Angels, and of all the Saints, shew pity to thy creature."—*Sermo de Laud. B. Mar. Virg. t. iii. p. 576.\**

Remains the third extract from an *Encomium of the Martyrs*. This I have observed, is acknowledged by Assemani to be genuine. But Mr. Keary does not merely err in declaring the contrary, but, by a strange perversity, does not see that the *Faith of Catholics* does not quote at all from the homily mentioned by him, namely, the homily on *ALL the Martyrs*.† The extract is from an encomium on the *Holy Martyrs*, and is a perfectly distinct production from the preceding, but equally genuine. Does this mistake arise from ignorance? If so, it fully bears out Pope's well known assertion, that a little learning is a dangerous thing. The reader, I am persuaded, would think me justified after what he has seen in passing any remark, however severe, on the want of common candour and knowledge, shewn at every turn, by the flippant critic of Nunnington. But I refrain, and content myself with having destroyed, I trust for ever, his claim to accuracy of statement, knowledge, candour, and critical learning.

The extract from the "Address to the Martyrs"‡ is given as follows:—"I entreat you, O holy martyrs, who have suffered so much for the Lord, that you would intercede for us with him, that he bestow his grace on us."

As the works of this Father are somewhat scarce, I have selected a few more passages, from the many which occur in S. Ephrem's writings, in favor of the Invocation of Saints, which I will lay before the reader. In a sermon in praise of the band of forty martyrs, he thus appeals to these holy champions of Christ.§ "Help me, you Saints, by your intercession; and, you beloved of God, by your prayers; that Christ, by his grace, may excite my heart to compunction,

\* Vide *Assem. Proleg. in Opera. S. Ephrem*, pp. 110, 111.

† The title to the piece alluded to by Mr. Keary, is "an encomium of the glorious martyrs who throughout the whole world have suffered martyrdom."

‡ Commonly called the *Forty Crowned Martyrs*.

§ On the authenticity of the Sermon, see *Assem. Proleg. p. 107*.

and enlighten my understanding.”—*Tom. i, p. 283.* His concluding words are addressed to the mother of these holy champions:—“I beseech thee, Oh faithful and happy mother, to pray to the Saints in my behalf: say to them, I intercede, Oh triumphant martyrs of Christ, for the lowly and wretched Ephraim, that he may obtain mercy; and, by the grace of Christ be saved.” *l. c.*

Might not Mr. H., if allowed, have referred to some such passages as these, which occur in almost every second page of the writings of this Father. I will add the following address to the B. Virgin, both for its intrinsic beauty, and because it shews that, even at this early period, the same terms which now give so much umbrage to Protestants, were then in use in the Church. The prayer opens thus:—“In thee, Patroness and *Mediatrix* with God, who was born from thee, the human race, O Mother of God, placeth its joy; and ever is dependant upon thy patronage; and, in thee alone, hath refuge and defence, who hast full confidence in Him. Behold, I also draw nigh unto thee, with a fervent soul, not having courage to approach thyson, but imploring, that, through thy intercession, I may obtain salvation. Despise not, then, thy servant, *who placeth all his hopes in thee, after God*; reject him not, placed in grievous danger, and oppressed with many griefs; but, thou, who art compassionate, and the Mother of a merciful God, have mercy upon thy servant, free me from fatal concupiscence, &c.” *Tom. III. p. 532.*

Surely, this is more than enough, to shew, that “if the prayer books of modern Catholics have been ransacked, to prove that divine honor is paid to this Queen of Saints, and if the most innocent expressions, well understood by us all, have been deemed sufficient argument against us, I fear our saint, of whom S. Gregory of Nyssa, hath said such glorious things, must fain help us to bear the burthen of modern condemnation.”\*

X. From S. Ephrem we are led, by the “Faith of Catholics,” to S. Gregory of Nazianzum, a writer of the Greek Church, surnamed the Theologian, the illustrious friend of S. Basil, and the Isocrates of the Fathers. We have two quotations from the writings of this eloquent saint, and two references to others. On this Mr. Keary says, “Gregory Nazianzen is adduced as the author of an oration in praise of S. Cyprian.”† This oration he notices, and nothing else. Will the reader believe that Mr. Keary is again guilty, *usque ad nauseam*, of suppressing evidence, and of gross inaccuracy. The *two pas-*

\* Vide *Catholic Magazine*, August, 1833—p. 27.    † Page 13.



*sages given* in the “Faith of Catholics” *he touches not*, and directs his strictures against *one* only of the *references*, which is adduced in the “Faith of Catholics” in these few words,—“in the same strain, he (S. Gregory) addresses S. Cyprian.” Has not the reader reason to wonder at that strange obliquity of judgment, or rather that wilful suppression of truth, which, in attempting to disprove the force of evidence adduced to support the lawfulness of invoking the saints, passes over all the direct and powerful texts, to fly to a miserable cavil on a mere reference. The conclusion is forced, though unwillingly, on the mind, that a man that can demean himself by recurring to such miserable arts, cannot have truth in view. A literary bully like Mr. Keary, if he make such an assertion as the worthy rector’s, “that of forty-two passages twenty are forgeries,” must needs, however, neglect the ordinary rules of warfare, and defend himself by the means that first offer themselves, however shameful and unjustifiable.

But, to follow our usual order.

1. “In his funeral oration on S. Basil,” S. Gregory says: “And now he, indeed, is in heaven; there, if I mistake not, offering up sacrifice for us, pouring out prayers for the people: for he has not left us so as to have deserted us. And do thou, sacred and holy Spirit, look down I beseech thee on us: arrest, by thy prayers, that sting of the flesh, which was given to us for our correction; or teach us how to bear it with fortitude: guide all our ways to that which is best: and, when we shall depart hence, receive us then into thy society; that with thee, beholding more clearly that blessed and adorable Trinity, which now we see in a dark manner, we may put a final close to all our wishes, and receive the reward of the labours which we have borne.” *Orat. xx. de Laud. S. Basil. T. i. p. 372-373.*

Mr. Keary does not, cannot, deny the authenticity of this beautiful oration;\* and will not, I trust, attempt to make us believe, against the evidence of our senses, that it is nothing

\* For particulars of this saint’s life, vide *Cave, H. L. P. i. p. 246*, &c. *Du Pin, Bib. des Auteurs Ecc. t. ii. p. 207*, &c. *Tillem. Mém. Eccles. t. ix.* *Basnag. Ann. 373, xvi—xix. et alibi, Butler, tom. 5.*

*May 9.* The writings of this Father consist of forty-six genuine orations (the four last of the fifty published in his works being doubtful or spurious) and two discourses to Cledonius; also, two-hundred and thirty-seven Letters, and one-hundred and fifty-eight Poems, published by the learned Abbé de Billy. Tollius printed at Utrecht, in 1696, twenty other poems of the Saint, called the *Cygrean Verses*; and the indefatigable Muratori, two-hundred and twenty-seven Epigrams. The Benedictine Edition, prepared by Dom Marand and his colleagues, is the most complete and accurate.

to the purpose. This passage evidently establishes, beyond doubt, that the opinion of this holy recluse differed in nothing from that of the Catholic Church.

2. Follows next the reference to S. Gregory's discourse on S. Cyprian. This, we have seen, Mr. Keary declares to be a forgery—"as must be evident," he continues, "to any one who will take the trouble of reading it." For once we have Mr. Keary's own judgment,—at least, he gives it as his own,—unsupported by any of his usual authorities. Unfortunately, Mr. Keary is as unhappy when he confides in his own judgment, as when he trusts in that of others. That it is not so evident, as Mr. Keary would fain lead us to believe, will, I think, be granted, when it is known that Tillemont,\* the laborious and profoundly learned author of the *Mémoires Ecclésiastiques*, has no doubt whatever of its authenticity. "In this Bellarmin agrees,—(the reader will perceive that I quote from Keary) for he does not even name it as doubted of, in the list of the Father's productions." His favorite, Du Pin, is against him;† and even his own arguments will not, evident as he judges them, induce the world to reject as spurious, a work which has hitherto been considered genuine. What, the reader will ask, are these mighty arguments? I give them in Mr. Keary's own words:—"The author gives an account of the Bishop of Carthage, so directly at variance with what is known of him, and, indeed, so utterly unworthy of so great and good a man,—such as his being a magician, possessed with the devil, and other similar fooleries,—that he was evidently an ignoramus, most likely some *illiterate monk of the leaden ages of Popery*." I am utterly at a loss to discover what part of this brief discourse could have so far led Mr. Keary astray, as to lead him to suppose that the writer considered S. Cyprian as a magician, or possessed with the devil. For my part, I have looked in vain for any such statements; and really believe that the worthy Rector of Nunnington must have been labouring under a mental hallucination when he penned this curious sentence, or have taken his observations "second-hand from some Protestant ignoramus." The sermon breathes, in every line, the burning spirit of S. Gregory; it is the florid, brilliant, and impassioned ascetic, luxuriating in fancy, and the wildest flights of oratory. Well would it be for Mr. Keary, may the reader justly exclaim, if he were such an "ignoramus" as was the writer of that discourse; and great the honor which, against his

\* *Till. Mém. Eccles. tom. 1x. Art. Grég. de Naz.*

† *Du Pin, Bib. vol. 11. p. 166, &c.*

intention, no doubt, the Rector of Nunnington does the “monks of the leaden ages of Popery,” by ascribing not only this, but a great part of the most valuable ecclesiastical remains of antiquity, to their skill and learning. Surely, if such were the case, then will *the leaden ages of Popery* have been more prolific in genius, and in great men, than the golden ages of Protestantism. Alas! for Mr. Keary’s taste; if such be his opinion of the sublime, the parishioners of Nunnington are but too often treated, I fear, to specimens of the ridiculous. Mr. Keary, no doubt, was misled by a passage of Du Pin, in which he observes, that S. Gregory refers in his panegyric to a dubious story told of S. Cyprian, *before his conversion*, in which something of the kind, referred to by Mr. Keary, is mentioned. Du Pin, however, does not entertain a doubt of the authenticity of the discourse.

3. Next follows a reference to S. Gregory’s Oration on S. Athanasius, as also a quotation from it in the following words:—“He, (Athanasius) in a good old age, dying after many conflicts, now regards, I doubt not, our concerns, and being himself freed from the flesh,\* *stretches out his hand to those who are labouring in the path of virtue.*” *Orat. xxiv. p. 425.* The learned Editors conclude their evidence by observing, that, from these orations, and from many others delivered on the like occasions, it is plain, what was then believed—that the martyrs and saints enjoyed eternal happiness in the vision of God; that they had care of men upon earth; that they interceded for them; and that it was profitable to invoke their prayers, for the obtaining of spiritual and temporal blessings.” These remarks are perfectly correct, so much so, that the Calvinist Daillé,† accuses the holy Doctor of having promoted the honoring of Saints by words and example.

XI. From the friend, we pass to the brother of S. Basil; the illustrious S. Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa. Mr. Keary has no comment to make on the two extracts from this Father,—one of which is of no inconsiderable length,—but proceeds at once to the authority of S. Ambrose. However, the testimony of this prelate is too important to be passed over in silence. That it is authentic, is undoubted,‡ and as an ardent prayer

\* χείρα ὀρεγεί τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῆ καλῆς καμνύσει.

† *De Relig. Cultu*, p. 51.

‡ This Father’s works are extant in three volumes in folio, published by the learned Jesuit, Fronto le Diu, *Parisiis*, An. 1615—1638. For the particulars of his life, see *Cave*, *H. L. t. i. p. 244.* *Tillem. Gr. Nyss. Mem. Eccles. tom. ix. pag. 561—617.* In favor of the authenticity of this work, vide *Tillem. p. 614.* *Du Pin, Bibl. p. 687,*



to the glorious martyr whose praises it celebrates, is an evident proof of the agreement of his belief with ours.

1st. Addressing himself, say the editors of the “Faith of Catholics,” to the Martyr Theodorus, on whose feast he delivered an oration, this brother of S. Basil speaks in this strain:—“Invisible though thou art, come as a friend to them that honor thee; come and behold this solemn feast. We stand in need of many favors: be our envoy for thy country before our common King and Lord.”\* The country of the Martyr is the place of his suffering; his citizens, his brothers, his relations, are they who possess, who guard, who honor him. We are in fear of afflictions; we look for dangers; the Scythians approach us with dreadful war. Thou, indeed, hast overcome the world; but thou knowest the feelings and the wants of our nature. Beg for us the continuance of peace,† that these our public meetings be not dissolved; that the wicked and raging barbarism overthrow not our temples and our altars; that he tread not underfoot our holy places. That hitherto we have lived in safety, we owe to thy favor; we implore thy protection for the days that are to come;‡ and if a host of prayers be necessary, assemble the choirs of your brother martyrs, and supplicate altogether for us. The united services of so many just will cover the sins of the people. Admonish Peter, solicit Paul, call John, the beloved disciple, and let them intercede for the Churches, which they themselves have founded.” *Orat. in Theod. Martyr, t. II. p. 1017.*

2nd. In the life of S. Ephrem, he thus addresses that holy deacon:—“Do thou now, being present at God’s altar, and with his angels, offering sacrifice to the Prince of life, and to the most holy Trinity, remember us; *begging for us the pardon of our sins.*”§ The authorities referred to in favor of the preceding, attest also the genuineness of this passage; that “it is to the purpose,” is evident.

XII. S. Ambrose. The “Faith of Catholics” cites three passages of considerable length from this holy Bishop;—the first from his *Book on Widows*; and the second and third

*Bellarm. De Script. Eccles. p. 92. Benedict. Vita S. Greg. c. XIX. Butler, vol. III. p. 102.* On the authenticity of the second extract from the life of S. Ephrem, besides the writers referred to above, vide *Lardner, Cred. of Gospel Testimony, vol. IV. p. 297.*

\* *πρεσβευσον υπερ της πατριδος προς τον κοινον βασιλεα.*

† *αιτησον αιρηνην.*

‡ *σοι λογιζομεθα την ενεργεσιαν—αιτημεν δε και τω μελλοντος την ασφαλειαν.*

§ *αιτημενος ημιν αμαρτηματων αφεσιν.*

from his discourse on SS. Peter and Paul. Before citing the extracts, let us hear what Mr. Keary says to the evidence from this ornament of Milan. "The 53d sermon of Ambrose, on Peter and Paul, *which* Bellarmin (*De Scriptor. p. 104*) declares, *cannot by any possibility* be his; and indeed with *all other critics*, he rejects *the whole lot of sermons* which go under this Father's name, as spurious." I know not whether most to admire the grammar, or the matter of this sentence; if sentence it can be called. Mr. Keary says, or rather means to say, by this confused heap of words, that the fifty-third sermon ascribed to S. Ambrose, is spurious; and that Bellarmin, and all other critics, extend this judgment to all the sermons which go under this Father's name.

But first, does any one pretend that the treatise '*de Viduis*' from which the first and most important extract is taken, is not genuine? If not, why does Mr. Keary omit all mention of this passage. Does he not do it for the same motive as induced him to have recourse to a similar suppression of evidence in so many other instances, namely, that he may lead the reader to believe that nothing but the extract impugned by him is to be found in the "Faith of Catholics," and that consequently his remarks totally destroy all the supposed evidence from S. Ambrose. I must again repeat that this is a want of common candour and honesty, which would disgrace any cause, and stamp with infamy any writer. A man that is careless of reputation may, by such shifts as these, raise a momentary shout of triumph, but that triumph cannot be durable. The arts that obtained it, are, sooner or later, detected and exposed, and those who were most deceived are generally the loudest in their condemnation of the man that led them into error. If Mr. Keary thought the passage spurious, why not tell us so? Did none of the many writers on the works of the Fathers, furnish him with an opinion to that purport? If not, Mr. Keary's ingenuity could not surely have been at fault:—he might still read the work himself, as he did the oration of Gregory Nazianzen, and declare it "*evident to any one who will take the trouble of reading it*, that it is a forgery of some illiterate monk of the leaden ages of Popery." Or even the authenticity of the work being, as it is, beyond controversy,\* another resource was still left; for

\* For a particular account of this Father's Life and Writings, vide *Cave, H. L. t. 1.*; and *Lives of the Fathers, vol. II.* Du Pin, *Bib. des Auteurs Eccles. t. II.* Tillem. *Mém. tom. x.* Vit. S. Amb. a Bened. adornata. Pagi *Ann. 369, XIII. 374, III.* Beausobre *Hist. de Manich, t. 1. p. 366, not.* The best edition of his works is by the two Maurist Benedictine editors Du Frische and Nic. le Nourri, 1686. All these writers agree in the authenticity of the treatise *De Viduis*. See also *Bellarmin. de Scrip. Eccles. p. 95.*

Mr. Keary might pronounce it to be "*nothing to the purpose.*" But to this the passage itself would give the lie; and I beg to recommend it, in a particular manner, to the attention of the reader. "The Fathers of the Western Church," says the *Faith of Catholics*, "speak the same language:—'Thou hast friends who may intercede for thee. These are the Apostles and the Martyrs. It is not nearness of blood, but the relationship of virtue, that forms this friendship. Associate thyself, therefore, with Peter and Andrew, that they may pray for thee, and thy bad desires may cease. Peter and Andrew interceded for the widow. (*Luke iv. 38.*) It were well if we could obtain so speedy an intercessor: but surely they who implored the Lord for their relation, can do the same for us. You see, that she who was a sinner, was little fitting to pray for herself, or at least to obtain what she asked. Other intercessors to the Physician were therefore necessary. The angels who are appointed to be our guardians, must be invoked; and the martyrs likewise, whose bodies seem to be a pledge of their patronage. They, who in their blood washed away every stain of sin, can implore forgiveness for us; they are our guides, and the beholders of our lives and actions; to them, therefore, we should not blush to have recourse."—*Lib. de Viduis, t. II. p. 200.*

2. We come now to the extract from the Sermon on SS. Peter and Paul, and to the authorities alleged against its genuineness by the Rector of Nunnington.

First, "Bellarmin," says the Rector, "declares that this *cannot, by any possibility*, be S. Ambrose's." Bellarmin, I am sorry for the Rector's character, 'says no such thing. Bellarmin's words, which I transcribe in the original Latin, in the margin, are, that "some of the sermons contained in the three volumes of the works of S. Ambrose, cannot be his."\* Is there no difference between *some* and *all* in the vocabulary of the Rev. Rector? The learned Cardinal then proceeds to tell which he deems spurious. Amongst these there is no mention of either of the discourses cited in the "*Faith of Catholics.*" He does indeed refer to the fifty-third sermon of this writer, and says, that "as it is found also in the works of S. Maximus, it is not possible absolutely to decide to which of these Fathers it belongs; but that, in either case, it is the production of a holy and early writer."† But it so happens,

\* "*Certum est aliquos sermones non posse esse S. Ambrosii,*" *p. 95.* The Benedictine edition of his works, and the account of his life in the thirteenth volume, is by Dom Montfaucon. His opinion on the sixty last Homilies on the Statues, is somewhat more unfavorable than that of other critics.

† "*Sermones sequentes nempe 3,—53, &c., sunt ad verbum inter*



that the fifty-third sermon in the edition edited at Paris, in 1549, which is the edition used by Bellarmin,\* is very different from the fifty-third sermon in the Benedictine edition of his works, by Messrs. Kirk and Berington. The fifty-third of Bellarmin is on *the Holy Sepulchre of our Lord*, and was spoken on the Saturday of holy week; the fifty-third of the "Faith of Catholics," as may be seen in that work, is on the Festival of SS. Peter and Paul. It is evident, I presume, that Bellarmin's authority is not with, but against Mr. Keary, and that the worthy Rector's reference to the Cardinal, is another proof of his inaccuracy, ignorance, and want of candour. Of his inaccuracy,—since the fifty-third sermon cited by Bellarmin, is different from that quoted by Messrs. Kirk and Berington; of his ignorance on the same grounds, and of his want of candour,—since he makes Bellarmin say that *all*, whilst his words are that only *some* of the sermons, found in the edition of S. Ambrose's works, cannot be that Father's.

2nd. Having disposed of the authority of Bellarmin, it may be asked whether it be true, as Mr. Keary assures us, "that all other critics agree in declaring that this sermon on SS. Peter and Paul,—for there are several in S. Ambrose's works,—is spurious; or rather whether they reject all the sermons, in one mass, as spurious. The Benedictines, in their edition, have placed the sermons in an appendix,—but are far from pronouncing them all spurious. Tillemont, who had the advantage of having the labours and remarks of these learned monks before him, though he does not undertake the examination of each particular discourse, mentions some that are, in his opinion, certainly from the pen of S. Ambrose.† Every critic, whose works I have consulted, speaks in the same manner.‡ They all agree that some are of doubtful, others of certain authenticity. As Mr. Keary speaks of these critics in general terms, I am obliged to meet his assertion in similar language; and, must farther observe, that I am not acquainted with one who positively numbers either of

sermones S. Maximi, ut plane judicari non possit, utrum Ambrosio, vel Maximo tribui debeant. Sed cujuscunque sint, antiqui et sancti auctoris sunt." p. 96.

\* "Opera ejus in editione Parisiensi, An. Dom. 1549, qua ego utebar cum hæc scriberem." p. 93.

† "Il est certain que le discours contre Auxence, et les Oraisons Funèbres de Valentinien II, et de Théodose, sont véritablement de lui," etc. *Tillem. Mém. Eccles. tom. x. p. 302.*

‡ Du Pin must be excepted. In his usual superficial way he asserts, "that there is none of them that has his style or air." *Du Pin, vol. II. p. 231. Engl. Trans.*

the sermons cited in the "Faith of Catholics," amongst the sermons that cannot possibly be from the Bishop of Milan. The contradictory proposition to that advanced by Mr. Keary is probably correct, that not one single critic pronounces *the whole lot* to be spurious. Bellarmin he indeed quotes, but most incorrectly; the Benedictine Editors of his works, though they throw the sermons into an appendix, do not decide that they are all spurious: \* Tillemont assures us, that many are evidently genuine; and this opinion, Mr. Keary himself will no doubt adopt, if he will take the trouble to read these valuable productions.†

3. Even though it be granted that many, though not all, the sermons are spurious, the question, as far as the value of the evidence is concerned, would be little affected. If the discussion would not lead me from the immediate subject, it might, I think, be shewn, that no argument has been adduced, against the authenticity of these sermons, which can affix them to a later period than that of S. Maximus, from whose pen many writers conceive most of these sermons are.‡

I need scarcely observe, that it will appear obvious to the reader, that from the first extract cited in the "Faith of Catholics," S. Ambrose coincided in opinion with us, and that Messrs. Kirk and Berington were justified in referring to the following extracts, which, after all, are of very inconsiderable importance when compared with the first.

The passages from the contested sermons are the following: "they are not dead, whose Feast we this day celebrate; but, being renewed, they live; for they are made partakers of Christ, who is the life of all. Their bodies, indeed, perished; but the progress of life was not broken. Without intermission, they return thanks to God, and repeat the praises of their Saviour." *Serm. LIII. de SS. Petro et Paulo, t. II. in Append. p. 464.* "As often as we celebrate the Memories of the Martyrs, we should meet together, casting behind us all the cares of life. The Lord hath said, (LUKE x. 16.) *he that honoureth you, honoureth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me.* He, therefore, who honours the Martyrs, honours Christ; while he that despises the Saints, despises the Lord." *Serm. II. Ibid. p. 465.*

XIII. The eloquent Bishop of Milan is followed by S. Epiphanius, the learned Archbishop of Salamis. The passage

\* *Ed. Bened. tom. II. App.*

† Besides the writers referred to in note (page 45) I would direct Mr. Keary's attention to *S. Basnag. Ann. 374. n. x. et alib. et Ja. Basnag. Hist. de l'Eglise, l. XIX. ch. IV. n. IX. p. 1171.*

‡ *Vide Bell. l. c. Tillem. l. c.*

cited from his great work the "*Panarium*," is highly consolatory to all Catholics who are accused, in honoring the B. Virgin, of being guilty of idolatry. Let Mr. Keary peruse the observations of this Father, and place them by his own comments on the extract from S. Bernard, and, I doubt not, he will see at once, that S. Epiphanius and the Rector of Nunnington disagree most widely. Yet, S. Epiphanius was no mean judge of what the law of God allowed; and I suspect, that if his opinion, and that of Mr. Keary, were to be weighed against each other, the world would soon decide in whose favor the balance turns. From his infancy, this Father had devoted himself to the study of the Sacred Scriptures,\* for which he had prepared himself by an accurate acquaintance with that species of lore of which Mr. Keary professes himself ignorant, namely, the Hebrew, the Egyptian, and the Syriac languages.

Having censured the practices of certain heretics, who paid an undue honor to the Virgin Mary, he says:—"Her body, I own, was holy; but she was no God. She continued a Virgin, but she is not proposed for our adoration; she herself adoring him, who, having descended from heaven and the bosom of his Father, was born of her flesh. Against this error the Gospel itself has guarded us, Christ saying, (John ii. 4) '*Woman, what is it to me and to thee? My hour is not yet come.*' He calls her *woman*, lest any one should imagine, that she was of some superior nature. Though, therefore, she was a chosen vessel, and endowed with eminent sanctity, still she is a woman, partaking of our common nature, but deserving the highest honors shewn to the Saints of God. She stands before them all, on account of the heavenly mystery accomplished in her. But we adore no Saint: and as this worship is not given to Angels: much less can it be allowed to the daughter of Ann. Let Mary, therefore, be honored; but the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, alone be adored: let no one adore Mary."—*Adv. Collyridianos Hær.* LIX. *sive* LXXIX. tom. i. pp. 1061, 1062, 1064.

\* His great work appeared in 374, under the title of *Panarium*; or, *Box of Antidotes against all Heresies*. He gives the history of twenty heresies B.C., and of fourscore since the promulgation of Christianity. These heresies he confutes both by the Scriptures and tradition. "Tradition," he says, "is also necessary. All things cannot be learned from the Scriptures; therefore the Apostles left some things in writing, others by tradition, which S. Paul affirms, saying, 'as I have delivered to you,'" &c. (*Hær.* 60. c. vi. p. 511.)



That this work is authentic no one has ever denied;\* and though the above passage be not a *direct* proof of the lawfulness of *invoking*, it is *of honoring*, the Saints; and furnishes evidence highly valuable of the light in which these holy men were considered, at the time of this Archbishop.

XIV. The admirable doctor of the Church, the eloquent Chrysostom comes now under our observation. The "Faith of Catholics" presents us with three extracts, from three different Homilies of this Father; namely, the first, from his Homily on SS. Bernice, Prosdoce, and Domnina; the second, from a Homily on S. Matthew; and the third, from a Homily on a part of S. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians; and refers for additional information, if necessary, on this writer's sentiments, though without actually quoting the words, to two other Homilies, one on S. Melitus, and another on S. Berdnice, &c.

Now, reader, I pray thee, notice Mr. Keary's observations. They are of a piece with the rest. "Those writers (Messrs. Kirk and Berington) quote Chrysostom's Sermons, on the Feasts of various Martyrs, to the people of Antioch, referring, specifically, to the 45th and 53rd. Now, as this Father left only twenty-one sermons, *ad Pop. Antioch*, the rest must necessarily be forgeries,—thus Bellarmin (*De Script. p. 129*) and Du Pin (*Bib. tom. iv. p. 170*) decide." Without the explanation which I have just given, would not these words of Mr. Keary, naturally lead us to suppose, that the 45th and 53rd Homilies to the people of Antioch were alone alluded to by the "Faith of Catholics?" And yet the real fact is, that neither of these Homilies is actually quoted; one of them is not even referred to at all, and the other merely cited as a reference, whilst the actual quotations from Homilies 51, 5 and 1, are not even noticed in Mr. Keary's remarks. Moreover, Mr. Keary would lead us to believe, that the extracts are confined to his sermons to the people of Antioch, whilst of three, two of the passages are from Homilies of a quite distinct class, and are of a genuineness that is beyond cavil. But we have seen too much of this clerical low cunning to be surprised at its repetition.

---

servetur ad imum  
Qualis ab incepto processerit et sibi constet.  
HOR. de Arte Poet.

But to his authorities. 1st. "Bellarmin," says Mr. Keary, "is decidedly of opinion that S. Chrysostom left but twenty-

\* Vide Tillem. *Mém. Eccles. tom. x. p. 507—509. Ceillier, t. viii. And la Vie de S. Epiphane avec l'Analyse des Ouvrages de ce Saint, et son Apologie, 4to. à Paris. 1738.*

one sermons *ad Pop. Antioch.* and the rest consequently must be forgeries." Now, mark this, reader: this assertion is utterly "false." It is a most unpardonable misstatement: I blush for Mr. Keary as I write,—to assert that Bellarmin ever advanced any such opinion. I feel, that if it were not for the sake of those into whose hands Mr. Keary's pamphlet may have fallen,—if it were not for his parishioners, who may, by an exposure of his real character in this one instance, be led to doubt of his veracity in others,—that I should, after so many gross instances and proofs of the want of the most common honesty in the Nunnington Rector, be demeaning myself by pursuing such a man any farther through his shameful and barefaced inaccuracies. Bellarmin, I repeat it, says no such thing. His words are: \*—"In the fifth volume there is no piece, the authenticity of which can be contested, except the Homilies to the people of Antioch, twenty-one of which only, *are said to be found* in the MS. of the old libraries; and, indeed, from the very text, it is evident that many of the Homilies are only fragments of the Homilies of Chrysostome on Matthew, John, the Acts, or the Epistles of S. Paul. Thus, for instance, the 27th Homily to the people of Antioch is composed of fragments taken partly from his 10th, 11th, and 12th, of the Acts of the Apostles; whilst his 60th and 61st to the same audience, are framed from his 83rd Homily on Matthew, and his 45th on John. However, this is a matter of little consequence, as they are composed of extracts from other works of the same writer." The opinion of Du Pin, Mr. Keary's second authority, is similar to that of Bellarmine. He too, observes, that of these Homilies some are most likely his, whilst others are unworthy of him,—and some evidently from his pen.† The learned and judicious Tillemont, whose life, and observations on the writings of this Father are unequalled, considers many of these Homilies besides the twenty-first, to be authentic.‡ This, in fact, is the general opinion of critics, to whose writings I must refer

\* In quinto tomo omnia fere sunt certa, et indubitata exceptis homiliis ad pop. Antioch. ex quibus viginti et una tantum *reperi* dicuntur manuscriptæ in antiquis Bibliothecis; et aperte colligitur ex contextu ipsarum permultas esse fragmenta Homil. Chrys. in Matthæum, vel in Joannem, vel in Acta Apostolorum, vel in Epistolas Pauli; et ex. gr. homilia ad pop. Antioch 27 una decerpta est partim ex homil. 10, partim ex 11, partim ex 12, in Acta, &c.—*Bell. De Script. Eccl. p. 121.*

† *Du Pin Bibl. tom. iv. p. 224, 84, &c.*

‡ *Tillem. Mém. Eccl. tom. xi. pp. 367, 369, and note 108, p. 620. Also, note 109, p. 621.*

the reader, and content myself with citing them in the margin.\*

Having vindicated the authority of the references impugned by Mr. Keary, I shall proceed to the extracts as they occur in the "Faith of Catholics."

1. In his Sermons to the People of Antioch, *on the Feasts of various Martyrs*, say the Editors, he exhibits in glowing colors, the honors that were paid to their remains; the miracles wrought by their prayers; and the splendid examples of many virtues produced by the fervor of imitation. "We, on this day, celebrate their feast. But, on all days, let us pray and beseech, that they become our patrons:† for, not only when alive, but much more when dead, they can inspire confidence. Now they carry about them the marks of Christ; and when they shew these, nothing will be refused to them. Since they are become thus powerful, thus admitted into the friendship of God; if, by constant endeavours, we associate ourselves with them, we cannot fail of obtaining the mercy of heaven." *Homil. LI. de Sanctis Bernice, &c. t. II. p. 645.* Of the authenticity of this Homily there is not a doubt,‡ and its importance will not be contested even by Mr. Keary. Montfaucon, the scrupulous editor of his works, places it amongst his genuine productions.§

2. In his 5th Homily on S. Matthew's Gospel he asserts, that "The prayers and supplications of the Saints are highly powerful in our regard:|| but these most, when our own penitential works, and the serious reformation of our lives are joined to them. And this we say, not intimating that the saints should not be invoked;¶ but that we should not give ourselves up to idleness, and rely on the exertions of others." *Hom. V. in Matt. t. VII. p. 79, 81.* The observations made on the preceding Homily apply to this. The same authorities attest its authenticity,\*\* and the same evidence does the passage furnish in favor of the Catholic doctrine.

3. The third passage is from a Homily on S. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians, and is the most important of the three.

\* *Cave, Hist. Lit. t. 1. Fabric. Bib. Gr. tom. VIII. p. 553. Tillem Mém. tom. XI. Vita a Bened. Adorn. Opp. tom. XIII. p. 91, &c.* See also his *Life by Stilling, tom. IV. p. 401—709.*

† *γενεσθαι προστατιδας ημων.*

‡ See the authorities above referred to, not one of whom doubts it.

§ *Ed. Bened. tom. II. p. 645.*

|| *εχουσι δυνα μιν αι ευχαι των αγιων μεγαστην.*

¶ *ουκ ινα μη κετευωμεν της αγιως.*

\*\* *Vide etiam Lard. vol. IV. p. 588, 539.*



“ It is good to partake of the prayers of the Saints ; but when we ourselves are careful and vigilant. You may say, when such are my dispositions, what need have I of others prayers ? But truly, we are, at all times, in want. Paul did not say, what need have I of others prayers ? though they who prayed for him deserved not to be heard : and you dare to say this. Nor did Peter say it, *when prayer was made without ceasing by the Church to God for him. (Act. xii. 5.)* Indeed, the very circumstance of your confidence proves, that you are in want of prayers. Were you as holy as Paul himself, your want would be the same. Exalt not yourself, lest you be humbled. But, as I observed, the prayers of others will avail us most, if we be earnest ourselves in the practice of virtue. S. Paul says : *For I know that this shall turn to my salvation, through your prayer, and the supply of the spirit of Jesus Christ. (PHIL. i. 19.)* And again : *You helping in prayer for us ; that for this gift obtained for us, by the means of many persons, thanks may be given by many in our behalf. (2 Cor. i. 11.)* And you say, what need have I of others prayers ? Prayers, then, are efficacious ; but it is when we, on our side, do our duty. This being so, let us not condemn the prayers of the saints, nor rely solely on them. By the latter, we should rashly deceive ourselves ; by the former, deprive ourselves of what is good and profitable. *Let us, then, invoke their intercession, and beg that they extend to us a helping hand,* while we ourselves remain constant in the pursuit of virtue.” *Homil. i. in 1 Thess. tom. xi. pp. 429, 432.*

After this, Mr. Keary will surely rank S. Chrysostome amongst the professors of what he insultingly terms Popery ; at least, on this question. That the passage is authentic needs no proof ; we have the concurrent agreement of all critics in its favor ;\* and if Mr. Keary would but adopt the sentiments which it inculcates, he would be the first to burn his pamphlet. Will Mr. Keary allow me to recommend the works of this eloquent bishop to his study. If he will give them that attention which they deserve, he would not be the first who has returned to the “ old paths,” by finding them trodden by this truly great man.

4. Of all these passages, the reader will observe, that Mr. Keary does not say one word. His strictures are confined, as I have noticed, to the following references made in the “ Faith of Catholics.” “ See *Homil. XLV. de S. Meletio, t. II.*

\* Besides the authorities already referred to, vide *Montfaucon, tom. xi. Lardner, Credib. of Gosp. Test. vol. iv. p. 547. Tillem. Mem. tom. xi. p. 376. Art. 145. Bellarm: de Script. Eccl. p. 118.*

p. 518. *Homil. de SS. Bernice, Prosdoce et Domnina. Ibid. p. 634.*" His remarks on these references I have shewn to be unfounded, and noways tending to weaken their authenticity.

XV. St. Asterius of Amasea. "The Saints, in virtue of their power with God, are the intercessors of the world.\* We adore not the Martyrs, but we shew honor to them as the true adorers of God. We worship not men; but we admire those, who, in time of persecution, nobly died in his service. We deposit their remains in monuments of curious workmanship, and we raise magnificent temples to their memories, that we ourselves may learn to emulate their deeds. Though dead, the Saints can still do much: they can impart favors to us.† *Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his Saints.* (Ps. cxv.) Wherefore let us offer up our prayers to God, and entreat the Martyrs that our common Lord would communicate the spirit of compunction to those who err; and that all doubt, as a wall of separation, being removed, we may all meet together, in fraternal union." *Encom. in SS. Martyres, t. i. pp. 191, 198, 207. In Nov. Auctario Combesis. Paris, 1648.*

We have no observations on this passage from Mr. Keary. That the doctrine, which it inculcates, is perfectly similar to that now maintained in the Catholic Church, he will not, I fancy, deny. Its authenticity is as clear and undoubted as its force. In fact, no critic denies the genuineness of the fourteen first Homilies of the Bishop of Amasea.‡

XVI. S. Jerome, the acute dialectician, and the profound Biblical scholar, comes next under review. Both passages, for two are cited in the "Faith of Catholics," are directed against the Heretic Vigilantius:—the first is from a splendid piece of indignant oratory and argument against that heretic, in favor of the lawfulness of honoring relics,—which Vigilantius, in this a true Protestant, denied; and the second, from another treatise against the same writer, which might be cited entire, since every line is as well adapted to the controversies of our days, as to those for which it was written.

\* παρρησια δικαιων εκτελει τας υπεσ τω κοσμω προσβειας.

† πολλα και τελευσαντες αγιοι δυναται. και απελθοντες τω βιον ευ εργησιν ανθρωπων.

‡ His works were published by F. Combesis, in his *Auctarium* to the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. The fourteen first are undoubtedly genuine. Several of the latter appear uncertain; and, perhaps, are the productions of Asterius, Bishop of Scythopolis, mentioned by S. Jerome in his Catalogue. Vide *Butler, Oct. 30. vol. x: p. 556.*

1. The first passage treats rather of the *honor* due to the Saints and Angels, and to the relics of the Just, than of the lawfulness of invoking them; but is still a valuable comment on the strange accusations brought by Mr. Keary against Catholics. "We worship not, we adore not the relics of Martyrs, nor Angels, nor Arch-angels, nor Cherubim, nor Seraphim, lest we serve the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for evermore. But we honor the relics of the Martyrs, that our minds may be raised to him, whose martyrs they are. We honor them, that this honor may be referred to him, who says: *He that receiveth you, receiveth me.*"—(MAT. x. 40.) *Ep. xxxvii. Adv. Vigil. ad Riparium. t. iv. Pars. ii. p. 279.*

2. The second extract contains an express argument in favor of the lawfulness and reasonableness of addressing our supplications to the triumphant friends of Christ. "Thou dolt! who, at any time adored the Martyrs? who could fancy that a mortal was God? If the Apostles and Martyrs whilst upon earth, and while they must be anxious for themselves can pray for others, much more will they do it when victory has crowned their triumphs.\* Moses obtained forgiveness for six hundred thousand men in arms; and Stephen, the true disciple of Christ, and the first martyr, begs forgiveness for his persecutors; and shall their power be less when they are with Christ? The Apostle Paul declares, that two hundred three score and sixteen souls, sailing with him, were saved by his prayers (ACTS, xxvii. 37); but, when dissolved, and with Christ, shall he be silent, and not utter a single word for that world, which believed at his preaching?" *Adv. Vigil. Ibid. pp. 282, 283.*

I have said nothing of the genuineness of these two tracts, because Mr. Keary must know, if he know anything about the works of this Father, that they are both of undoubted authenticity.†

XVII. S. Augustin. Though Mr. Keary could find nothing to object against the evidence of S. Jerome, he has ventured on the experiment against that adduced from the

\* *Quanto magis post coronas, victorias et triumphos?*

† S. Jerome answers the common argument from the "impossibility of the saints being able to hear our prayers, as they cannot be everywhere," in these words: "*Tu Deo leges pones? Tu Apostolis vincula injicies, ut usque ad diem judicii teneantur custodia, nec sint cum Deo suo? de quibus scriptum est, sequuntur Agnum quocunque vadit; si agnus ubique, ergo et ii qui cum Agno sunt ubique esse credendi sunt.*" *l. c.* On his works and life, see *Lardner, Cred. of Gosp. Test. vol. iv. p. 403—412.*



great light of the Latin Church ; with what success we shall see. The extracts from this holy Bishop occupy nearly three pages of the "Faith of Catholics." The first and longest is from S. Austin's work against Faustus, the Manichee. Then follow, a citation from his two-hundred and twenty-third sermon ; "*de Diversis*," two references to his "*City of God* ;" a quotation from his two-hundred and eighty-fifth sermon on the holy martyrs ; "*Castus and Æmilius* ;" another from his "*Tract on S. John's Gospel* ;" two farther quotations from his treatise "*On the Care due to the Dead* ;" and, lastly, an extract from his "*Meditations* ;"—making in all, seven actual quotations, and two references. What does Mr. Keary say to these copious proofs ? Notice, reader, I pray thee, his answer ; for it contains an instructive lesson. "Augustine's sermon *de Diversis* and *Meditations* are quoted. On the sermons of this Father generally, Du Pin, (*Bibliothèque*, tom. iv. p. 170) observes, that they are mostly of very doubtful authority, and invariably so much interpolated, that little that is genuine can be gleaned from them ; these referred to here, he declares, are clearly spurious, as is also the little tract called the *Meditations of Augustine*."\* Seek in these remarks for any notice of the first and leading extract from the work against Faustus, and you will seek in vain ;—for the passage from the *Tract on S. John*, still in vain ;—for some passing comment, at least, on the unequivocal evidence furnished by the two citations from the treatise *On the Care due to the Dead*, and your search will still be fruitless. Does Mr. Keary class these passages amongst those references, "some of which are quite irrelevant, and even contradictory of the Romish (Catholic) doctrine." The passages shall soon speak for themselves, and settle that question for ever.

From the above statement it will be easily seen, that Mr. Keary passes over, as usual, in silence, all that seems to him to make against his extraordinary assertion. However, having allowed himself once to deceive, it is not surprising that he should have less difficulty in having recourse a second and a third time, or as often as it serves his purpose, to similar arts.

He that once sins, like him that slides on ice,  
Goes swiftly down the slippery ways of vice ;  
Though conscience checks him, yet those rubs gone o'er,  
He slides on smoothly, and looks back no more.

But to pass to a more agreeable task ; from the disingenuous and crude observations of the Rector of Nunnington, to the clear and copious remarks of the Bishop of Hippo.

1. The first passage, it has been said, is from a work which no one has ever yet pretended was, or could have been, written by any other man,\* that masterpiece of controversial writing, his work against Faustus. This shrewd and metaphysical follower of Manes objected, as Mr. Keary might do to the Catholics, their veneration and festivals of the martyrs. The following passage, from the "Faith of Catholics," is part of S. Augustine's answer:—"The Christian people celebrate the memories of the martyrs with a religious solemnity, in order that they may learn to imitate them, and may be associated to their merits, *and be aided by their prayers*: but, to no martyr, to the God alone of martyrs, in memory of them do we raise altars. For what bishop, amongst the repositories of holy bodies, assisting at the altar, was ever heard to say: to thee, Peter,—to thee, Paul,—or to thee, Cyprian; do we make this offering? To God, alone, who crowned the martyrs, is sacrifice offered in the places where their relics rest: that the sight of those places may excite a warmer sentiment towards those whom we should imitate; and towards him, by whose aid it can be accomplished. We venerate, therefore, the martyrs, with that veneration of regard with which holy men are here treated upon earth, who are disposed we know, to suffer for the truth of the Gospel. When they have suffered, and have conquered, our veneration is more devoted and more firm, as they are translated from a state of conflict to a state of permanent happiness. But with that worship, which the Greeks call *λατρεία*, and which, in Latin, cannot be expressed in one word, as it is a worship properly due only to the Divinity, *with that worship we worship God alone*. To this belongs the offering of Sacrifice, whence they are idolaters

\* For an account of the life and writings of this Father, vide *Cave, H. L. t. i. p. 290, &c. Du Pin, Bibl. Ec. t. iii. p. 158, &c. Augustini, Vita a Benedictinis Conscrip. Pagi Ann. A. 395, xvii. 430, n. xxviii. S. Basnage, Ann. 384, n. vi. 430, n. iv. et alibi. Tillem. Mém. Ec. t. xiii.* This last writer employs the whole of his thirteenth volume in giving a history of his life and writings. See also *Lardner, Credib. of Gosp. Testim. vol. iii. p. 277, 278; vol. iv. p. 489-492. Butler, vol. viii. Bellarm. de Script. Eccles. p. 121—136.* Many entire editions of his works have been published. Possidius, the disciple of S. Augustine, fortunately has left us an account of his works. The best edition is that published by the Benedictine Maurist monks, which was begun by Dom Delfau, continued by Blampin, with critical notes upon the sermons and supposititious writings, by Coutant. The work against Faustus is divided into thirty-three Books, in which he states and answers every objection of that acute sophist. For an abstract of this work, the reader may refer to *Butler, vol. viii. p. 471, 472, note. Tillemont, vol. xiii, p. 292, 293.*

who sacrifice to idols. We offer no sacrifice to any martyr, nor to any saint, nor to any angel; and should any one fall into the error, sound doctrine will so raise its voice, that he will be condemned, or corrected, or avoided. The saints themselves, whether men or angels, reject the worship, which is due, they know, to God alone. Thus, Paul and Barnabas, (*Acts* xiv.) when moved by their miracles, the Lycaonians, would sacrifice to them as gods, rending their garments, and confessing that they were mortal men, like to them, forbade it to be done. The same was seen in angels, as we read in the Apocalypse, (xxii. 9) where the angel refused adoration, saying, *I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren: adore God."* *L. xx. c. xxi. contra Faustum. t. viii. p. 347.*

It is evident, from the above passage, that S. Augustine, and the Catholics of his time, honored the martyrs, in order *to partake in their merits, and to be assisted by their prayers.* The Bishop of Hippo, consequently, was, on this question at least, an orthodox Catholic.

2. Next follows a brief extract from one of his sermons *de Diversis*, that is, on various subjects. The extract is confined to these few words:—"If any one say to you, do you worship Peter? Return him for answer what Eulogius said of Fructuosus: *I worship not Peter, but worship him, whom even Peter worships.*" *Serm. cclxxiii. De Diversis, t. x. p. 1108.*

This moves the indignation of the critical Rector. "Augustin's sermons *de Diversis*," says he, "are quoted. Du Pin assures us that most of these sermons are of doubtful authenticity; all interpolated; and *those referred to here* clearly spurious." Now, it so happens, that *only one* sermon from the class called *de Diversis*, is cited by the "Faith of Catholics," namely, the two-hundred and seventy-third, from which the foregoing extract is taken. Mr. Keary, no doubt, fancied that the extract that follows, from a sermon on the holy Martyrs, Castus and Æmilius, was from the same class; if so, this is only a fresh proof of his almost total unacquaintance with the writings of the Fathers, whose productions he pretends to criticise. But, is it true, that S. Austin's sermons *de Diversis* are of the character given them by Mr. Keary?

1. Had Mr. Keary taken the trouble to look at the remarks of the Benedictine editors of his works, he would never have ventured on a remark, which adds disgrace upon disgrace to his page. Coutant, after Mabillon, the most acute critic amongst the Maurist monks,\* carefully discriminates the sup-

\* This is clear, not only from his remarks on the works of S. Austin, but also from his edition of S. Hilary, and that of the Decretals, or Epistles of the first Popes.



posititious from the genuine sermons; and Mr. Keary might, at one glance into the fifth volume of that magnificent edition, have seen the shameful folly and ignorance of his assertion. Du Pin does not make the assertion which Mr. Keary ascribes to him,—and had he but read the remarks of that critic, he would not have condemned, “in one fell swoop,” so large and valuable a portion of the writings of this Father. Du Pin, in fact, adopts, in almost every instance, the opinions of the Benedictine, even when the Louvain editors and others have declared against the genuineness of a particular piece.\* That some sermons have been ascribed to S. Austin, which he never pronounced, is certain,—and these are carefully noticed, and placed in an appendix by the learned editors of his works; but, unfortunately for Mr. Keary, the two cited in the “Faith of Catholics” are not of that number. Tillemont also, has carefully examined the remarks and judgment of Coutant, and fully expressed, in his life of S. Austin,† in what he differs from that critic, but makes no remarks unfavorable to the authenticity of either of the sermons condemned by Mr. Keary. Bellarmin,‡ whose authority he refers to on other occasions with so much complacency, is here against the Rector. The judicious Lardner§ quotes the 273rd sermon as authentic: an authority to which, on a question of criticism, even the profoundly learned Mr. Keary will bow.||

Having, therefore, vindicated the sermons of S. Austin from the ignorant aspersions of Mr. Keary, and shewn that the particular sermons referred to by the “Faith of Catholics” are authentic, I will only observe, that Mr. Keary had but little cause to waste so much bold assertion on the first, at least, of these extracts, which has been already quoted; which the reader will have observed, only repels a favorite calumny of all heretics, that in *honoring* the saints, we necessarily

\* Vide *Du Pin, Biblioth. tom. III, p. 711*; also, *p. 717, 733, and passim*. Du Pin goes through every volume of the Benedictine edition of his works, and in his sentiments on the 5th Tome, he adopts entirely the opinions of the editors.

† *Mem. Eccles. tom. XIII.* This volume, as the most important, was first finished by Tillemont; the first six volumes only of the remaining collection were perfected and revised by him.

‡ *Bell. de Scrip. Ecc. p. 130, 135.*

§ *Lardner, Credib. Gospel Testimony, vol. IV. p. 532.* See also, *Appendix Augustin.* published at Antwerp, in 1703, *pag. 549.*

|| The Paris edition of S. Austin's works coincides with the Benedictine; as also the edition printed at Lyons, in 1570.

worship them. As Mr. Keary has re-echoed this cry, he, indeed, must have felt a particular interest in the passage.

3. We are next told, by the learned editors, that "the same doctrine is repeated still more fully in the celebrated work, entitled, "*Of the City of God.*" *Lib.* VIII. c. XXVII. *Lib.* XXII. c. x. t. VII. pp. 217, 673. Mr. Keary, sparing as he is of his remarks on actual quotations, seldom allows a reference to pass by unnoticed. Accordingly, we meet with the following remarks:—"Of the rest of the references, some are quite irrelevant, and even contradictory of the Romish doctrine, which they are brought forward to defend. As, for instance, on Augustine's *City of God*, these authors are bold enough to affirm, (though they wisely quote nothing in proof) that the *worship of saints* is repeated still more fully, in this elaborate work, referring the reader to *Lib.* VIII. c. XXVII; and *Lib.* XXII. c. x. On looking into the first chapter referred to, I find the following: 'We do not erect temples, raise altars, or offer sacrifices to the martyrs, because not they, but their God, is ours. We honor their memory indeed, as holy men of God, who contended unto death for the truth, that the true religion might be propagated, and the false abolished; for we do not worship our martyrs with God's honor, nor men's crimes, as they worship their God,—neither do we offer sacrifice to them, nor change their disgrace into their religion.'"

On this I observe, *first*: that Mr. Keary is incorrect when he asserts, that Messrs. Kirk and Berington affirm, that the *worship of saints* is repeated still more fully in their references to the *City of God*. The antecedent quotation is one repelling the accusation of idolatry, as will be seen by referring to my remarks contained in No. 2, and does not say one word about the invocation of saints; or, as Mr. Keary is pleased in his superior wisdom to term it, the *worship of saints*. It is not suprising, then, that in looking into the places referred to, he should merely find, what the authors of the "Faith of Catholics" told him that he would.

2. However, did Mr. Keary really find nothing but what he has given us in his translation of the chapter referred to; or, rather, does he give us, in the two sentences, culled from various parts of that chapter, a true and full summary of its meaning? Reader, he does not. Not to notice the unintelligible jargon which he has made of the words "*nec eorum probra in eorum sacra convertimus,*" which mean, *that the Christian does not, as the Gentile did, make that a matter of religious worship and respect in the conduct of their departed heroes, which was truly a disgrace to them,*—but which Mr. Keary translates, *nor change their disgrace into their religion;* nor the ignorance displayed by rendering the plural noun

*memoriæ*, by the word *memory*.\* I must protest against that insincerity which could pass over a most important portion of that chapter, and declare that it contained nothing but what he has extracted that really affects the subject. In perusing that chapter, Mr. Keary must have seen the declaration, that when the faithful assembled on any of the Festivals of the Saints, they did so for two purposes; first, that “by that solemnity they might return thanks to the true and living God for the victory of the Saints; and, secondly, that taking occasion from the memory of their actions, they might excite themselves to an imitation of that conduct which obtained for them an eternal crown, invoking for that purpose his assistance, whose particular festival they celebrated.” *l. c.*† His translation of the second reference is so gross a misquotation and misrepresentation of S. Austin’s meaning, that I was astonished to meet with it even from the pen of the Rector. In the text I will give a literal translation of the passage, and the original in the margin.‡ The omissions that affect

\* “*Memoriæ Sanctor. Martyrum*,” places consecrated to the memory of Martyrs. Vide *Du Cange, Dict. Med. et infim. Latin. in verbo*.

† As the last words of the above extract are somewhat ambiguous in the original, I lay the passage before the reader. “*Quis autem audivit aliquando fidelium, stantem sacerdotem ad altare etiam super sanctum corpus martyris, ad Dei honorem, cultumque constructum, dicere in precibus; offero tibi sacrificium, Petre, vel Paule, vel Cypriane, cum apud eorum memorias offeratur Deo, qui eos et homines et martyres fecit; et sanctis suis Angelis cælesti honore sociavit; ut ea celebritate et Deo vero de illorum victoriis gratias agamus et nos ad imitationem talium coronarum et palmarum eodem invocato in auxilium ex eorum memoriæ renovatione adhortemur.*” The meaning given in the text seems to me the only rendering of the passage, which will agree with the context, and the scope of the saint. The agreement of this passage with that given in the “*Faith of Catholics*,” extends not merely to a similarity of argument, but even to the use of the same words: one passage is evidently copied from the other, which confirms the interpretation of the words given above. “*Populus Christianus memorias martyrum religiosa solemnitate concelebrat et ad excitandam imitationem, ut meritis eorum consocietur, atque orationibus adjuvetur, ita tamen ut nulli martyrum, sed ipsi Deo martyrum sacrificemus, quamvis in memoriis martyrum constituamus altaria. Quis enim antistitum in locis sanctorum corporum assistens altari aliquando dixit. Offerimus tibi, Petre, aut Paule, aut Cypriane, sed quod offertur, offertur Deo, qui martyres coronavit...&c.*” *Contr. Faust. l. c.*

‡ “*Illi talibus Deis suis, et templa ædificaverunt, et statuerunt aras, et sacerdotes instituerunt, et sacrificia fecerunt. Nos autem martyribus nostris non templa sicut diis, sed memorias sicut hominibus*



the meaning will be seen from the words printed in italics. "The Gentiles to these gods of theirs built temples, raised altars, appointed priests, and offered sacrifice. But we, on the contrary, do not build temples to our martyrs *as to gods*, but edifices in their memory, *as to departed men*, whose spirits live with the Lord; nor do we raise in these edifices altars, on which to offer sacrifice to the martyrs, but to sacrifice to the only God, who is our God, and the God too of the martyrs; at which *sacrifice* their names are mentioned, but not invoked, by *the sacrificing priest*, each in its proper place and order, as men of God, who, by the confession of His name, have triumphed over the world. For the priest offers sacrifice to God, and not to the martyr, though he sacrifice in memory of the martyr, being the priest of the most High, and not of the martyr. The sacrifice is the body of Christ, &c." *l. c.* I will now put Mr. Keary's translation in contrast with the preceding, "as an illustration of the Rector's mode of making an ancient writer support modern error."\* "On looking to the second reference, I (Mr. Keary) read,—'We build to martyrs no temples, but only erect to them monuments, as in memory of men departed, whose spirits are at rest in God. We erect no altars to sacrifice to them, who offer only to him who is their God and ours; at which offering these conquerors of the world, as men of God, have each one his peculiar commemoration, but no invocation at all.'

Let the reader compare the two translations, and he will easily perceive why Mr. Keary omitted the important words *as to gods*, thereby making S. Austin contradict a well-known usage of those days. He will perceive that the omission of these words quite alters the meaning of the remainder of the passage. S. Austin does not say that the saints "*have no invocation at all*," to use Mr. Keary's classical language, but simply this, that they are not invoked by the *sacrificing priest* as gods, whilst the deceased heroes of the Gentiles were really invoked as such. The argument of S. Austin clearly points to this meaning. Mr. Keary shews but little tact in citing a passage which evidently points to usages, rites, and circum-

mortuis, quorum apud Deum vivunt spiritus fabricamus: nec ibi eregimus altaria, in quibus sacrificemus martyribus, sed uni Deo, et martyrum, et nostro, sacrificium immolamus; ad quod sacrificium, sicut homines Dei, qui mundum in ejus confessione vicerunt, suo loco et ordine nominantur, non tamen a sacerdote, qui sacrificat, invocantur. Deo quippe, non ipsis sacrificat, quamvis in memoria sacrificet eorum, qui Dei sacerdos est, non illorum. Ipsum vero sacrificium corpus est Christi..." *Leon. Coquæi Edit. p. 1494.*

stances, found only in the Catholic Church, as *a sacrifice*, a *sacrificing priest*, a *ritual*, containing the very prayer, the beginning of which is cited by Austin, and the very same commemorations that were made use of by that Father.

I know not whether the reader is wearied with tracking Mr. Keary's devious path; I can assure him that I, at least, am fatigued and disgusted. Were he a generous and sincere antagonist, I should respect him; but when I see him on all occasions carefully omitting those passages which make against him, striking out words which totally change the meaning of the author, to make them serve his own purpose; changing the punctuation, when it may serve a similar turn; translating falsely, when it pleases him not to have recourse to any other shifts; with the best wish not to judge uncharitably of any man's actions, I must say, that it would be the mere cant of affectation to pretend, that I can have any feeling but contempt and disgust towards the writer that can stoop to such acts, and demean himself and his cause, by the vilest shuffles of partisan trickery, and petty-fogging chicanery. These would be my feelings towards any writer on any subject, that should act as Mr. Keary; but when I reflect that he calls himself a Minister of Religion, and pretends to teach, and lead others by his example to the truth, a sensation of horror mingles with my other feelings, and I shudder at the account, which he will have one day to render of those souls, from whom, as far as in him lies, he endeavours, by foul and unjustifiable means, to keep the knowledge of the truth.

3. The third passage from S. Austin is extracted from his 285th Sermon, on the anniversary festival of the holy martyrs Castus and Æmilius. As I have already shewn that this sermon is authentic, I shall content myself with placing it before the reader as it is translated, by Messrs. Kirk and Berington, from the Benedictine Edition:—"We pray for the other faithful departed, but not for martyrs: for they departed this life in a state of such perfection, as rather to be our advocates. But they are advocates, not by their own merits, but as members united to their head. He is truly the only advocate, who, sitting at the right hand of the Father, intercedes for us. There is one Advocate, as there is one Pastor."—*Ser. cclxxxv. in Natal. Mart. Casti et Æmilii, t. v. p. 1147, Ed. Bened. Paris. 1683.*

4. The Exposition of S. John is undoubtedly by S. Austin,\* and from the first part of this work, the authors of "The

\* His one hundred and twenty-four tracts on the Gospel of St. John were begun by him in 416, and are homilies which he preached during the week. In these, he often confutes the Arians, Mani-

Faith of Catholics" extract the following passage :—" Jesus Christ the just is our advocate with the Father : he is the propitiation for our sins. Therefore, *some one will say: do not the saints pray for us?* do not bishops and pastors pray for the people? Listen to the Scriptures, and learn, that pastors recommend themselves to the prayers of the people. The Apostle says, *praying with all for us.* (COLOS. iv. 3.) He prays for the people, and the people for him. We pray, brethren, for you; and do you pray for us. Let all true members pray for one another; and the head intercede for all."—*Tract. I. in 1 Joan. Pars II, t. III. p. 831.*

5. Writers are pretty well agreed, that the treatise "On Care for the Dead," from which two extracts are next given, was addressed to S. Paulinus in the year 421. Its authenticity is not disputed. The first passage is as follows :—" It is a proof of kind regard towards the dead, when their bodies are deposited near the monuments of saints. But hereby in what are they aided, but in this, that, *recollecting the place where they lie, we be induced to recommend them to the patronage of those saints, for their prayers with God?* Calling, therefore, to mind, the grave of a departed friend, and the near monument of the venerable martyr, *we naturally commend the soul to his prayers.\** And that *the souls of those will be thereby benefitted,* who so lived as to deserve it, *there can be no doubt.*"—*De Cura pro Mortuis gerenda, C. IV. t. vi. p. 519.* The second extract is equally clear and valuable : "But, by what means the martyrs assist those, whom we believe to be assisted by them, is a question surpassing the means of my understanding,—whether they be personally present in many places remotely distant, or whether, praying in general for the wants of all who invoke their intercession, (as we pray for the dead, from whom we are absent, and of whom we know nothing) God Almighty, every where present, hearing the supplications of his martyrs, may, by the ministry of his Angels, grant the succours that are requested. This, I say, is a question too deep for me to reach, too abstruse for my penetration."—*Ibid. c. CXVI. p. 528.*

It must have been a bitter punishment, indeed, to Mr. Keary, not to be able to deny the authenticity of the two preceding passages; since they not only clearly establish the lawfulness of invoking the saints, but also demonstrate that

chees, Donatists, and Priscillianists.—Vide *Butler, Vol. 8, p. 457*; and the authorities referred to in the previous notes on the works of this Father.

\* *Eidem Martyri animam dilectam commendat, recordantis et precantis affectus.*



the practice of praying for the dead was universal in the African Church, at the time this work was written. The second extract has, I hope, been carefully perused, as it contains S. Austin's opinion on a difficulty, often proposed against our doctrine, in which that Father acknowledges, that no objection drawn from mere human reasoning, is enough to induce him to reject a practice so consoling and invaluable, brought down to him, by a thousand sources, from the days of our Saviour.

Is it not singular that Mr. Keary, in looking at the evidence from the Bishop of Hippo, should not say one word about such evidence as the above, and seize on a mere reference, take the trouble to place it before the reader in a translation, and even misquote it. The reason, however, is plain :—these extracts were such as no sophistry or art, however mean, could weaken ; neither the omission of a word, nor the transposition of a comma, could alter their meaning ; and his faint love for truth could not tear from him the confession, that S. Austin was, on this point, a Catholic.

6. The following passage closes the evidence from S. Austin :—" Holy and immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God our Saviour Jesus Christ, deign to intercede in my behalf before him, whose temple thou hast deserved to be. Celestial choirs of Angels, Archangels, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, Priests, Levites, Monks, Virgins, and all the Just !—by him, who has elected you, and the contemplation of whom forms your felicity, I presume to beg of you, that you would deign to supplicate God, for me a sinner, that I may deserve to be freed from the jaws of the devil, and eternal death."—*Medit. cXL. t. ix. p. 350. Paris, 1586.*

This tract Mr. Keary tells us is *clearly spurious*. The more common and true judgment is, " that it is either S. Austin's, or of one who had read his works carefully."\* It is given with this caution in the ninth volume of the folio edition of his works, published at Paris. This was also the opinion of Erasmus. Bellarmin,† however, considers the work genuine. But if we suppose, with the Benedictine editors,‡ that it is a compilation from parts of his soliloquies and confessions, and from the writings of Hugh of St. Victor, I see not what great subject of triumph the Rector of Nunnington will obtain. Many eminent men have considered, and still consider, the work authentic ; and why were the

\* Autor est vel B. Augustinus, vel qui ejus libros non indiligenter legit. *Tom. ix. p. 334.*

† *Bellarm. de Script. Eccles. p. 132.*

‡ *Vide Tom. vi. Append.*

editors of the "Faith of Catholics" not to be allowed to exercise their judgment on a question of criticism? At all events, the opinion of S. Austin, on the point in debate, is too clear to be doubted, and whether the "Meditations" be, or be not, his, may be a question of *some critical interest*,—but has no effect whatever on our judgment as to the opinion of S. Austin relative to the Invocation of Saints.

XVIII. St. Cyril, of Jerusalem. The observations made by the compilers of the "Faith of Catholics," on the opinions of this Father, are left untouched by Mr. Keary. In fact, he can, I think, have no objection whatever to the sentiments which they advance; namely, that the V. Mary was during, and before, the time of S. Cyril, called *the Mother of God*; and that, consequently, Catholics are justified in still giving her that high and sublime title. Though the passage is somewhat long, the information which it contains, and a wish to place the whole of the subject before the reader, will, I trust, be a sufficient apology for introducing it here.

"In the prayer which Catholics daily address to the V. Mary, are the words: 'Holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners, now and at the hour of our death.' The words *mother of God*, in Greek *θεοτοκος*, in Latin *Deipara*, to persons not fully acquainted with the doctrine of the *Incarnation*, nor with the necessity there often has been of opposing error by the introduction of terms not strictly scriptural, cause some difficulty. Against the errors of Arius, the word *consubstantial* was adopted; and the Council of Nice, which in 325, condemned those errors, defined in its creed, that Jesus Christ, 'consubstantial to the Father, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and became incarnate, and was made man.' The V. Mary was mother of him thus made man, but this man was God; whence arose the propriety of the expression, *Mother of God*. The expression had been very generally used, when, in the following century, one Anastatius, a priest, the confidential friend of Nestorius, then Bishop of Constantinople, in a sermon to the people, publicly taught, "that the V. Mary ought not to be called the Mother of God; that she was a mortal, and that of such God could not be born." These words, says the historian,\* who might himself have been present, gave great offence both to the clergy and laity; and 'a tumult arose within the Church.' I mention this incident, because nothing so clearly marks the commencement of error, as the reclamation of the people, when new expressions assail their ears, or when those, to which they have been habituated, are either censured or

\* *Socrates Hist. Eccles. l. vii. c. xxxii. p. 380.*

omitted. Nestorius espoused the language of his friend; and in a short time, not only Constantinople, but the whole Christian Church took the alarm; the doctrine of man's redemption being manifestly involved in the question. At the head of the orthodox party stood St. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, whose reasoning on the subject was comprehensive and profound. But he observed, that it would be well, would men abstain from such enquiries, in which the most learned see obscurely, and the ignorant are perplexed,—and embrace, without wavering, the Faith, that, through the Apostles, has been delivered to the Church. However, as the pride of man will not follow this rule, he proceeds to say, on the question before him, that as the Lord Jesus Christ is God, surely, she that bore him must be called the *mother of God*. 'This faith,' he adds, 'the disciples of Christ delivered, though they used not the expression.' But, since the Council of Nice, he observes, it has been used by many Fathers, whose names he mentions." *Ep. ad Monachos Ægypti. Conc. Gen. t. III. p. 19. &c.* St. Cyril, in this Epistle, and in many more which he wrote on the subject, strongly insists, that if the nature of the hypostatic union be considered,—that union, whereby the divine nature was so united to the nature of man, as to form but one person,—it must necessarily follow, that it is true to say, that God was born; and, therefore, that Mary was the mother of God; that God suffered, and that God died for us. Whatever doctrine teaches not this, manifestly overturns the belief in the Divinity of Christ; and with this error Nestorius was charged. Cælestin, the Roman Bishop, supported the cause of S. Cyril; and finally, in 431, the Council of Ephesus anathematised the errors of Nestorius, and deposed him from the See of Constantinople. From this time, the words of our prayer *Mother of God* have been universally used; and they may be considered as a profession of our belief in the divinity of her Son. In the Apostles Creed we say: "*Born of the Virgin Mary.*" If Mr. Keary is anxious to know the opinion of this eminent patriarch on the lawfulness of invoking the saints, he will find ample information on this subject in the Seventh and Ninth Books of this Father's reply to Julian. *Tom. II. lib. 8, 9.* As my remarks have already extended to an unexpected length, I hasten to the remaining extracts.

XIX. Theodoret, the illustrious historian, and scholar of Theodore of Mopsuestia, (not *Theodoret of Mopsuesta*, as Mr. Keary calls him) is next adduced as evidence. Unfortunately, from Theodore, Nestorius had imbibed the principles of his capital error. The orientals, however, defended Theodore; and Theodoret, as Mr. Keary tells us,



at one period of his life, "strenuously defended his cause and works against St. Cyril." In these writings Theodoret undoubtedly adopted certain expressions favorable to Nestorianism, which *expressions* were condemned in the fifth General Council. Nevertheless, his *sentiments*, as Tillemont conceives,\* were always orthodox. At all events, he wiped away whatever stain might have at one time darkened his character and writings, by his humble and Christian behaviour at the Council of Chalcedon, in which the writings, and even the person, and the name of Theodore, were condemned and anathematised.

These observations seemed to me necessary, to enable the reader to judge of the force of Mr. Keary's argument, against the authenticity of Theodoret's eighth sermon, cited by the "Faith of Catholics." "Theodoret's sermons, he objects, *on the Cure of the Gentiles*, carry with them their own condemnation, for *they speak* of Chrysostome as then living, though he died long prior to the time of Theodoret; and they condemn his most intimate friend, Theodoret, of Mopsuesta, whose cause and works he strenuously defended. Neither Gennadius, in his treatise on the writings of the fifth century, nor Honorius, nor Sigbert Glembourensis, of a later age, mentions them."

1. One part of this argument, that from the intrinsic evidence, I have disposed of by the foregoing remarks. Theodoret, in public council, condemned the writings of Theodore; we cannot therefore be surprised to find him doing the same in a private discourse. As well might he argue, that the fourth of his five books on "Heretical Fables" is spurious, because in this book we find him inveighing as bitterly against Nestorius, as he had before, unwarily, applauded and defended him. The other part of his argument, drawn from the pretended mention of S. Chrysostome, is equally unfortunate. Theodoret, says Lardner,† as is computed, was born at Antioch, about 386, and died in 457 or 458. S. Chrysostome lived till the year 407. Mr. Keary consequently falls into a considerable anachronism when he tells us, that S. Chrysostome "died long prior to the time of Theodoret." But, observe the Rector's cunning. "The Faith of Catholics" refers solely to the eighth sermon,—Mr. Keary's arguments are directed against the whole lot of sermons of this Father. "*They*," says he, "speak of S. Chrysostome as still living, and *they* condemn his most intimate friend, Theodore." Now,

\* Tillem. *Mém.* tom. xv. Art. xix. p. 251.

† *Credib. Gosp. Test.* vol. v. p. 14. Also, Tillem. l. i. p. 207.

unless Mr. Keary meant to assert that these objections existed against the *particular sermon* cited by Messrs. Kirk and Berington, why adduce them? And yet he must be aware, that not only these objections are of no force, but that the eighth sermon is entirely free from any such statements as are implied in his difficulties.

But Mr. Keary adduces authorities to support his opinion. Neither Gennadius, nor Honorius, nor Sigbert Glembourensis, mentions the sermons "On the *Care* of the Gentiles,"\* *therefore*, mark the conclusion, *they cannot be his*. But if these three insignificant writers do not, hundreds of others do, or at least may, every tyro in logic will exclaim. If there be any principle of reasoning by which Mr. Keary's premises may be made to lead to his conclusion, I, at least, am unacquainted with it. Negative arguments are at all times suspicious and hazardous; but a negative argument, like the above, is the height of childishness. Why, Sir, to make your negative argument of any force, you ought to shew, that not only these writers, but all others, whose object led them to consider the writings of this Father, have failed to mention these sermons as the legitimate offspring of his genius. Even then the argument would be far from conclusive. But, instead of this, as I shall soon shew, not a doubt has ever been raised, by any writer of eminence, whose studies have caused him to examine the works of the historian.

But first, who is this Gennadius that he refers to? Is he the priest of Marseilles, who died about the year 492? If so, I am not acquainted with any works of his, but a book on *Illustrious Men*, and another *On the Dogmas of the Church*. It is true, that he is supposed to have composed several other works, which till now were thought to be lost to the world; but, if Mr. Keary has made so valuable a discovery, as a treatise by this writer *On the Works of the Fifth Century*; I trust he will not suffer it to remain long in obscurity, at the Rectory of Nunnington.

Or may it not be the illustrious Greek of the fifteenth century? But, no—that is impossible: as the Genadius referred to by Mr. Keary is evidently, according to the worthy Rector's chronology, long prior to the time of Honorius and Sigbert Glembourensis. Besides, I am unfortunately not acquainted with any work of the latter writer, that can,

\* Is this a typographical error, for 'on the *cure* of the Gentiles,' or another proof of Mr. Keary's ignorance? The latter, I think. The Sermons are entitled in the *Latin* Translation, "*De Curandis Græcorum affectionibus*." This Mr. Keary renders by, "On the *care* of the Gentiles."

by any possibility, be transformed into a *Treatise on the Writings of the Fifth Century*.

I am equally unfortunate as regards the second writer, to whose authority Mr. Keary has referred me. There is Honorius, the Emperor of the West, whom no one, I suspect, will accuse of having been guilty of much neglect in omitting to mention Theodoret's eighth sermon. Several Popes, and one Anti-Pope, of the same name, none of whom, before or after his ascension to the Papal Chair, ever favoured the world with a critique on the writings of Theodoret. There is also the, so called, solitary of Autun, who flourished in the thirteenth century; and lastly, the critic of Limoges, Honorée de Ste. Marie. Now, surely, if Mr. Keary knew himself, he would have essentially facilitated the enquiry, by telling us which of these several writers or individuals he expected to mention the eighth sermon of Theodoret, and who, by not mentioning it, clearly proved, to his mind, that sermon to be spurious. As Mr. Keary has not been pleased to inform the public, I must acknowledge my incapacity to do so, and must unwillingly pass to his third testimony, Sigebert, the monk of Gemblours, or, as the Rector names him, *Sigbert Glembourensis*. Little, no doubt, did this meddling monk of the twelfth century, ever think that his testimony would be adduced against the authenticity of the work of Theodoret. His "Chronicon," which is, probably, the work alluded to by Mr. Keary, if he have any particular production in view, is a confused, incorrect, and partial continuation of a work of the same name by Eusebius. As I am unable to refer to this work at the present moment, I cannot say whether Sigebert does, or does not, mention this sermon of Theodoret. But it is a matter of such little importance, that the trouble, if I had the book by me, would be ill-bestowed, even with the prospect of adding one more to the numerous mis-statements of the Rector.

What a piece of solemn trifling are his arguments, external as well as internal, against the authenticity of the passage of Theodoret! He argues from premises which he takes to be undoubted, and which, in reality, are the most direct anachronisms; and, with a parade of learning, cites obscure authors, and hard names mis-spelled, and dragged into his service, obviously for no other purpose but to cast dust into the eyes of his readers, by raking up his literary reminiscences of names, once noticed perhaps in his youth, but for what purpose age has forgotten. Had Mr. Keary any acquaintance with the opinions of true critics, he would know that the twelve discourses of Theodoret, on "Healing the Prejudices of the Gentiles," are considered of undoubted genuineness



by Sirmond, the learned and judicious editor of Theodoret's works; by the equally learned but prolix Garnier, who added to the four volumes before published a fifth, containing certain letters and discourses of the Bishop; by Bellarmin,\* in his "Scriptores Ecclesiastici;" by Tillemont, in his "Mémoires;"† Lardner,‡ in his "Credibility of the Gospel History;" by Butler,|| in his notice of this father's works; by Feller and Delandine, in their "Lives of Theodoret;" in a word, by every critic of eminence these sermons are ascribed to Theodoret, without even a hint that a doubt had ever been entertained of their authenticity by any one critic.§ To make such a discovery was reserved for the learned and profound critic of Nunnington, aided, no doubt, in his enquiries, by the valuable library of his esteemed friend, Mr. Oxlee, the orientalist.¶

Here terminate the critical labours of our reverend antagonist, who concludes that, after having followed Messrs. Kirk and Berington so far, it is unnecessary to pursue their quotations any farther. Most readers, if I mistake not, will, by this time, be pretty well convinced that it was most injudicious in Mr. Keary to engage at all in the "pursuit," in which he could only expect to fail, like so many of his predecessors, who had ventured on that dangerous ground to Protestants—the writings of the fathers. Many before Keary (for he is not original even in his extraordinary attempt) have engaged in a similar task, and have reaped nothing but labour and disappointment. Some have had the candour to acknowledge that the fathers were all to a man in favour of the Catholics, and have exclaimed, that the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants. This, Sir, is the only safe (if safe it may be called) ground to take; for if you venture on another, and appeal to the authority of the Pastors of the Church in the various ages of its existence, you will find your position

\* Page 145. † Page 333, tom. xv. ‡ Vol. v. p. 15.

|| Vol. i. p. 294.

§ See *Dissertation sur quelques Ecrits de Théodoret, Evêque de Cyr*, par M. Barratier. Also, *Du Pin*, vol. iii. p. 72, Eng. Trans.

¶ The extract is as follows: "The temples of the victorious martyrs rise conspicuous for their magnitude and the richness of their embellishments. It is not once, or twice, or five times, that we yearly approach them; but we frequently there assemble; and there not unfrequently sing praises to their God. They who are in health pray for its continuance; while they pray to be freed, who are oppressed with illness. *But it is not as Gods that they address the martyrs, but as celestial men, entreating them to become their intercessors.* οὐκ ὡς θεοὶς αὐτοῖς προσιόντες, ἀλλ' ὡς θεοὺς ἀνθρώπων ἀντιβόλουντες καὶ γενέσθαι πρεσβευτὰς ὑπὲρ σφῶν παρακαλοῦντες. *Sermo VIII. adv. Gentes*, T. iv. p. 605.

move from beneath your feet like a quicksand; and yet, without appealing to that authority, the Bible itself cannot be considered by you as of Divine authority, or be shewn to be free from interpolation, and the pernicious effects of a thousand arts of designing and interested men.

I shall investigate as briefly as possible the remaining evidence.

XX. The Council of Chalcedon, which is next referred to, was held in 451, to crush the Eutychian heresy. It was composed, according to some writers, of six hundred and thirty Bishops. Mr. Keary, no doubt, has a high veneration for its authority, as it falls within the number acknowledged by his Church. How he reconciles this with his own opinion, which confines the pure ages of Christianity to the four first centuries, I know not. In the eleventh action of this Council, "after having read," say the editors of the "Faith of Catholics," "the letter of Flavian, the fathers, with one voice, exclaimed: 'That is the truth; we all say the same: may Flavian's memory be immortal. Flavian, though dead, still lives; *the martyr will pray for us.*'" *Act. XI. Conc. Gen. t. iv. p. 697.*

To this is also added another passage, taken from a letter of certain Bishops of the province of Europa, written to the Emperor Martian: "We place the blessed Proterius in the rank of holy martyrs, and, *through his intercession*, we beg that God may be merciful to us." (*Ep. ad Leo. Aug. P. III.; Conc. Chalc. Conc. Gen. t. iv. p. 907.*) Both these passages clearly prove that the Bishops who were present at that Council admitted the lawfulness of invoking the Saints. Nor can the authenticity of the two letters be disputed, as Mr. Keary may soon assure himself, by referring to the fourth volume of Labbe's Councils.

XXI. S. Nilus. Little need be said on the brief testimony from this father. From it we learn, that the holy disciple of S. Chrysostome was persuaded, that the ministry of Angels is employed to excite us to prayer, that these blessed Spirits partake in our joys, and offer their prayers to God for us. "Learn, then, that the holy Angels excite us to pray, and are present with us, rejoicing, and praying for us." (*Tract. de Orat. c. LXXXI. t. i. p. 496.* The authenticity of the valuable treatise on Prayer, from which the above extract is taken, is clearly shewn by the editor of this father's works, Joseph Mary Suarez.\*

\* At Rome, 1673, Leo Allatius and F. Peter Polessines had published the Letters of S. Nilus previously. For particulars of this Saint's Life and Works, *vid.* Leo Allatius "Diatriba de Nilis, et eorum scriptis," at the end of his Epistles. *Jos. Assemani in Calend. ad 14 Jan. t. 6, p. 68.*

XXII. S. Leo. The learned editors cite next, four passages from the valuable writings of the great S. Leo. It was this holy Pope that summoned, and presided by his Legates, at the Council of Chalcedon, and it was his letter that extorted from the assembled Prelates, by the purity of its doctrine, the memorable exclamation, "Peter has spoken by the mouth of Leo." With this Father the list closes, "omitting, (say the editors) many other authorities, which we could adduce from other Fathers, and the Ecclesiastical Historians of this century, we shall here close the list with St. Leo, the Great." Nor could a more decisive, or a more respectable authority be selected: for of all the Fathers, there is scarcely one whose works bear more ample and clear testimony to the lawfulness of invoking the Saints, and none whose authority will weigh with greater force, on a judicious, and well-instructed mind, than that of this great light of the Latin Church.

Before citing the extracts, it will be well to make a few observations on the authenticity of the sermons of this Father, from which they are taken. Few writers have had the advantage of having their writings edited by critics as judicious and learned as were those of S. Leo. Quesnel, in his edition of this Pope's works, though he allowed himself to be carried away by a favorite theory, so far as to venture on altering the text, was still a laborious, a learned, and an impartial critic on all questions that did not affect his own peculiar opinions. Savioli and Poleti, at Venice, gave two editions of his works; and Cacciari, at Rome, published another far more complete, enriched not only with learned and critical dissertations on the works of this Pontiff, but also on the heresies of the times of S. Leo. But the Brothers Ballerini—names, which as long as sound criticism shall be respected, will be handed down to posterity with honor, published, in 1753, at Venice, an edition of S. Leo's works, truly valuable indeed. The preface is a masterpiece of sound criticism and erudition; and to this I must be allowed to refer Mr. Keary for any information which he may desire on the works of this Father. I will only add here, that of these various editors, not one has any doubt of the authenticity of the sermons from which I now quote. "Strengthen your connections with the Holy Angels; enter into the city of God, of which the dwelling is promised to us: unite yourselves to the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs. Rejoice, when they rejoice. Let their wishes be the object of your desires; and by a holy emulation, sue for their suffrages.\* For with whom you shall communicate in

\* Ipsorum ambite suffragia.



prayer, with them shall you enjoy honor." *Serm. v. in Epiph. t. 1. p. 195.* "As we ourselves have experienced, and our ancestors have evinced, we believe and trust, that amidst the troubles of this life, the prayers of the Holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, will ever be ready to obtain for us the mercy of God. As we are depressed by our own sins, so may we be raised by their merits, through Jesus Christ." *Serm. in Natal. Apost. Petri et Pauli, p. 338.* "May the Blessed Peter and all the Saints, who have aided us in many tribulations, vouchsafe to assist our prayers for you with our merciful God."\* *Serm. in Octava. Apost. Pet. et Pauli, p. 340.* "Let us rejoice in the Lord, for the happy end of this glorious man. God is wonderful in his Saints, in whom he has given to us defence and example. Rome is illustrated by Laurence, as Jerusalem was by Stephen. By his prayer and patronage we confidently trust to meet with support; that as all men, says the Apostle, (2 Tim. III. 12.) that will live godly in Christ, shall suffer persecution, we may be strengthened in the spirit of charity, and be fortified in the continuance of a firm faith, to surmount all temptation, through the Lord Jesus Christ, who with the Father and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth for ever." *Serm. in Festo S. Laurentii, p. 346.*

To close the evidence on this subject, the authors of the "Faith of Catholics," cite a number of passages from the early Liturgies of the various churches of Christendom. I shall not enter into any discussion relative to the date of these productions, as the subject falls under a separate head in the "Faith of Catholics." That they are of great antiquity is universally admitted; and that they are of great authority, will not be denied by any one who reflects on the great influence of all public and recognized rituals, and forms of prayer. Mr. Keary need only consider the authority which he himself attaches to the Book of Common Prayer, to convince himself, that the same arguments which induce him to appeal to that publication, with confidence, as furnishing an explanation of many of the peculiar tenets of his church, would also induce the christians of the church of Alexandria, Constantinople, Jerusalem, and of the other churches, whose Liturgies are there cited, to look upon those writings as an authoritative exposition of many of their well-known doctrines. The truth of the common saying, *Lex orandi, lex credendi*, is universally admitted.—For these citations, vide "Faith of Catholics," p. 448-451.

The length to which my observations have already extended, must be my excuse for not entering into an examination of

† Qui nobis in multis tribulationibus adfuerunt, obsecrationes nostras pro vobis juvari dignentur.

the argument which is so clearly and powerfully deducible, from the evidence furnished by these splendid monuments of the belief and pious practices of our ancestors in the faith. But though I abstain from entering into the discussion, I am not the less convinced that those extracts are overpowering against those who pretend, that an innovation was introduced into the faith delivered to us by our Saviour, by admitting the Invocation of the Saints. I am aware that a practice, which at once was followed in every part of the Church, could not have been an innovation; that we have a security against this, in the very nature of man, of society, and of the times during which this change is said to have taken place. But I abstain from any farther reflections on this point, as I fear the patience of my readers has been long since exhausted.

Before I conclude, however, I may be allowed to desire the public to contrast Mr. Keary's promise with his performance. He asserted, that "of forty-two quotations adduced in support of the Invocation of the Saints, by Messrs. Kirk and Berington, twenty-two are palpable well-known forgeries; and the remainder nothing to the purpose." It has been seen how this most extraordinary charge has been substantiated. The Rector, in commenting upon the authorities opposed to him, in no one instance has given the reader a fair statement of the evidence from any one Father; he has passed over in silence the most powerful texts; has been guilty of false translation in two instances, and of suppressing certain important words in another; and has even dared to alter the punctuation of the original, of which he pretended to place before the reader a literal English version; he has misstated the opinions of eminent critics in the most disgraceful manner; argued against writings which were nowhere mentioned by his opponents, as if their extracts had been from those sources; in a word, no art, however mean, seems to have been thought by him unworthy of being adopted, provided it but offered him an appearance of support. Not only has he not established his charge of *forgery in the twenty-two instances which he pretended to have discovered*; but not even has he clearly shewn, nor can he clearly shew, that one single authority of the forty-eight, adduced by Messrs. Kirk and Berington, is undoubtedly spurious. Every passage cited by them is found in the received and approved editions of the Fathers' works to whom they ascribe it; the authenticity of seven only of these numerous passages has ever been contested, whilst the remainder are acknowledged, by every writer, whose opinion in such matters is worth being mentioned, as of undoubted authenticity.

It has been no pleasant task to follow Mr. Keary, in the unworthy course which he has been pleased to pursue : nor has it been agreeable to comment on his conduct, in the manner in which I have found myself called upon to notice it ; but a love for truth, and a wish to put a stop for ever, if possible, to any similar attempt, will plead my justification. The reader, I trust, will be of opinion, that the Rector of Nunnington has but little cause to be pleased with the result of his labors in the province of criticism.

Oscot, *December*, 1833.















